***30 T.C. 322 (1958)***

A transfer of rights, even when using terms like “sale” and “assignment,” does not qualify as a “sale or exchange” of a capital asset for tax purposes if the transferor retains substantial rights and controls over the transferred property.

**Summary**

The case involved Joe L. Schmitt, Jr., who developed an accounting system. He entered into agreements with territorial franchise holders, granting them the right to use and sell his system in specific areas. The agreements included provisions for the franchise holders to divide territories into districts, grant licenses, and pay Schmitt a percentage of the revenue. The IRS determined that the payments Schmitt received were ordinary income, not capital gains. The Tax Court agreed, finding that Schmitt retained too much control over the system and the franchise holders’ operations to constitute a sale or exchange of a capital asset.

**Facts**

Joe L. Schmitt, Jr., developed the “Exact-O-Matic System,” a bookkeeping procedure using tabulating cards. He obtained copyrights and applied for patents for the system. Schmitt entered into eleven substantially similar territorial assignment agreements with franchise holders, granting them the right to use and sell the system in specified areas. These agreements included provisions where Schmitt received payments from the initial franchise sales and royalties from the licensees within the franchise territories. The agreements also outlined detailed control mechanisms Schmitt maintained over the franchise holders’ operations, including approval rights, minimum price controls, training requirements, and access to records. The IRS challenged Schmitt’s classification of these payments as capital gains.

**Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Schmitt’s income tax for 1949, 1950, and 1951, reclassifying his income as ordinary income instead of capital gains. Schmitt challenged this determination in the United States Tax Court.

**Issue(s)**

1. Whether the agreements between Schmitt and the territorial franchise holders constituted a “sale or exchange” of a capital asset under Section 117(a) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code.

2. Whether certain payments made by Schmitt for training the franchise holders’ personnel were deductible as business expenses.

**Holding**

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

1. No, because Schmitt retained significant rights and control over the Exact-O-Matic System, the agreements did not constitute a “sale or exchange” of a capital asset.

2. Yes, because the payments made by Schmitt for the training were proper business expenses.

**Court’s Reasoning**

The court focused on whether Schmitt had transferred all substantial rights to the Exact-O-Matic System. The court emphasized that despite the use of terms like “Territorial Assignment” the agreements involved more than just patent rights and retained significant control by Schmitt. The court examined the agreements’ provisions, which included Schmitt’s approval rights over franchise sales, control over district licensing, minimum sales requirements, minimum price controls, required use of specific licensing forms, and the right to inspect the licensees’ records. The court concluded that these retained rights, in combination, demonstrated that Schmitt had not divested himself of all substantial rights. The court cited the fact that Schmitt controlled the assignment of the franchises, the prices, and the licensees’ operations. Therefore, the payments received were not proceeds from a “sale or exchange” and did not qualify for capital gains treatment. The court further determined that Schmitt’s payments for personnel training were deductible business expenses.

**Practical Implications**

This case provides guidance on distinguishing between a sale and a licensing arrangement, especially for intellectual property. Attorneys should advise clients to carefully structure agreements when seeking capital gains treatment. The court’s emphasis on the transferor’s retention of control is crucial. Agreements that allow the transferor to retain the right to approve sublicenses, set prices, control operations, or receive continuing royalties are unlikely to be considered a sale for tax purposes. The case highlights the need to transfer all substantial rights to the property for the transaction to be deemed a sale or exchange, and the IRS will scrutinize any retained control. This case is critical for understanding the difference between selling an asset and licensing its use; future cases involving similar facts will likely refer to this case.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 