Robert Thomas and Susan B. Thomas, Husband and Wife, Petitioners, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 28 T.C. 1 (1957)

Whether the sale of real property resulted in ordinary income or capital gains depends on whether the property was held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of the taxpayer's business.

Summary

The U.S. Tax Court considered whether gains from the sale of phosphate-bearing land were taxable as ordinary income or capital gains. Robert Thomas, a real estate broker and rancher, along with a partner, assembled several parcels of land with the intent to sell them to a phosphate-mining company. The Court held that the profits from selling the assembled parcels were ordinary income, not capital gains, because Thomas was engaged in the business of assembling and selling land. The Court emphasized the systematic nature of his activities, including prospecting, obtaining financing, and negotiating sales, as evidence that the land was held primarily for sale in the ordinary course of his business, despite the ultimate sale being to a single customer.

Facts

Robert Thomas, a real estate broker and rancher, and Frank L. Holland began assembling parcels of land in Florida with known phosphate deposits. Thomas, having prospecting knowledge, prospected the lands for phosphate, obtained options, and arranged financing. They intended to sell the assembled acreage to a phosphate mining company and never planned to mine the phosphate themselves. Over two years, Thomas and Holland acquired eight parcels of phosphate-bearing land. They negotiated with International Minerals & Chemical Corporation, ultimately selling all eight parcels simultaneously. Thomas reported his gains as capital gains, while the IRS argued for ordinary income, arguing that he was engaged in the business of buying and selling real estate.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Robert Thomas's income tax for 1950, arguing that the gain realized from the sale of the land should be taxed as ordinary income rather than capital gains. Thomas petitioned the U.S. Tax Court to challenge this determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the gains realized by Robert Thomas from the sale of his interests in the phosphate-bearing land were taxable as ordinary income or capital gains, specifically focusing on whether the property was held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

Yes, because Thomas's activities in acquiring, holding, and selling the land constituted carrying on a business, and the sales were made in the ordinary course of that business, the gains were ordinary income.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 117(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which defines capital assets as property not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of a trade or business. The court analyzed Thomas's activities over a two-year period, including prospecting, securing financing, acquiring properties, and negotiating a sale. The Court held that the systematic and continuous nature of these activities, even though the ultimate sale was to a single customer, demonstrated that Thomas was in the business of assembling and selling land. The court found that Thomas acquired and held the properties primarily for sale to customers and sold them in the ordinary course of business. The court distinguished this case from those involving passive investments or casual acquisitions. "In acquiring his interests in the various parcels of land comprising the Homeland Assembly, it was petitioner's intention to hold, and in fact he did at all times hold, such interests primarily for sale to a customer or customers, and his activities in acquiring, holding, and selling his interests in such properties were such as to constitute the carrying on of a business, and his interests were held primarily for sale to a customer or customers and they were sold by him in the ordinary course of such trade or business."

Practical Implications

This case is significant for determining when land sales are considered ordinary income versus capital gains. Attorneys should consider the following factors when advising clients:

- The *frequency and substantiality* of the land sales.
- The *extent of the taxpayer's activities* in improving or developing the land (e.g., prospecting, obtaining financing, marketing).
- The *continuity of the taxpayer's efforts* and whether they are similar to those of a real estate developer or dealer.
- The *purpose for which the property was initially acquired and held*.
- Whether the *sales are to a single customer* or multiple customers (while sales to multiple customers strongly support ordinary income treatment, this case demonstrates it is not always dispositive).

This case emphasizes that even if the ultimate transaction involves a single sale, the determination of ordinary income versus capital gain depends on whether the land was held primarily for sale in the ordinary course of business, which is based on the *totality of the circumstances* and whether the taxpayer's conduct is indicative of a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

business or investment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.