Remer v. Commissioner, 28 T.C. 85 (1957)

The transfer of mineral leases in exchange for substantial initial payments and a per-unit royalty, without retaining control or a reversionary interest, qualifies as a sale eligible for capital gains treatment, not ordinary income.

Summary

Charles Remer acquired iron ore mining leases from the State of Minnesota and later assigned them to Charleson Iron Mining Company, in which he and his father held all the stock. The assignment included cash payments and a per-ton royalty. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued these payments should be taxed as ordinary income because Remer retained an economic interest in the ore. The Tax Court held that the transaction was a sale of capital assets and that the payments, including the royalties, were capital gains. The court focused on the complete transfer of ownership, the lack of Remer's control over production, and the substantial initial payments, distinguishing the situation from cases involving retained economic interests such as those involving a depletion allowance.

Facts

Charles Remer obtained two iron ore prospecting permits from Minnesota in 1945, which he converted into mining leases in 1946. In 1947, Remer assigned the leases to Charleson Iron Mining Company for a total price of $100,000 in cash, $50,000 in 1948, $50,000 in 1949, and $0.10 per ton of ore or concentrate shipped. Remer and his father owned all of Charleson's stock. The Commissioner argued these payments should be treated as ordinary income because Remer retained an economic interest in the stockpiled ore.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Remer's income tax, classifying payments received as ordinary income rather than capital gains. Remer petitioned the Tax Court, arguing for capital gains treatment. The Tax Court agreed with Remer and ruled that the payments were capital gains.

Issue(s)

1. Whether certain payments received by petitioners as a result of the transfer of rights in iron ore mining leases are taxable as ordinary income or as long-term capital gains.

Holding

1. Yes, because the transfers of the leases were absolute sales and the payments made to Charles, both the large down payments and the per ton payment, were properly treated as capital gains.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the principle of whether the taxpayer had “sold” the asset and hence is entitled to treat the proceeds as capital gain or whether he had retained an “economic interest.” The court considered prior case law related to depletion allowances. The Court stated that it must look to “the language employed by the parties, the subject matter, and the surromiding circumstances.” The Court emphasized that the Remer’s transfer of the leases was absolute, with no reversionary interest, and that Remer had no control over the production of ore. The court distinguished the case from those where the taxpayer retained an economic interest in the ore. The court emphasized that the large initial cash payments by the transferee were key factors in determining the transaction as a sale. Moreover, the court found similarities to situations like the Helvering v. Elbe Oil Land case, in which deferred payments measured by profits did not prevent a transaction from being treated as a sale. The court cited Commissioner v. Hopkinson to support the conclusion that the deferred payments were part of an installment plan for the sale, giving the purchaser full ownership rights, making the payment capital gains.

"This manner of paying for the property by the purchaser was but an installment plan which did not lessen the full and complete title to the property which was transferred to the purchaser and which gave it the rights of an absolute owner."

Practical Implications

The case provides guidance on how to structure the sale of mineral rights to achieve capital gains treatment, emphasizing the importance of transferring complete ownership without retaining significant control or economic interest. Practitioners should consider the size of initial payments and the lack of taxpayer’s control over the transferee’s operations. This ruling can be applied to other types of property sales where a per-unit or percentage of profits payment is included. Furthermore, the court’s reliance on a range of cases concerning the tax treatment of mineral leases provides a useful roadmap for analyzing future cases in this area.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.