Moore v. Commissioner, 28 T.C. 745 (1957)

Whether cattle were held for breeding purposes, entitling a taxpayer to capital gains treatment, is a question of fact, and mere designation of animals as part of a breeding herd is insufficient if the taxpayer's primary business is selling those animals.

Summary

The case concerns whether the Moores, who raised and sold Polled Hereford cattle, were entitled to capital gains treatment for the sale of certain cattle. The IRS argued the cattle were inventory sold in the ordinary course of business, thus taxable as ordinary income. The Tax Court held that while some cattle were held for breeding, and thus qualified for capital gains, the majority were not. The court distinguished between cattle demonstrably held for breeding purposes and those merely designated as potential replacements, especially where the primary business was selling cattle to other breeders. The court emphasized that the Moores' specialized treatment of the replacement herd animals did not automatically prove that they were held for breeding purposes.

Facts

M.P. and Annie Louise Moore, operating as Circle M Ranch, raised Polled Hereford cattle, improving the breed through selective practices. They maintained a breeding herd, replacement herds, and a sale herd. Calves were assessed at birth and weaning, with some placed in replacement herds based on their breeding potential. The Moores conducted annual auctions and sold cattle privately. They advertised the quality of their herd and entered cattle in exhibitions. During the years in question, they sold significant numbers of cattle, reporting gains as either ordinary income or long-term capital gains. The IRS challenged the capital gains treatment, reclassifying gains from the sale of certain cattle as ordinary income, arguing the animals were held primarily for sale.

Procedural History

The Moores filed joint federal income tax returns, reporting capital gains from the sale of some cattle. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies, reclassifying the gains on certain cattle sales as ordinary income. The Moores petitioned the Tax Court to contest the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the cattle sold by the Moores were held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business.
2. Whether the cattle qualified as livestock held for breeding purposes under Section 117(j)(1) of the 1939 Code, thus allowing long-term capital gains treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the Moores' primary business was raising and selling cattle.
2. Yes, for the 70 animals that were demonstrably held for breeding purposes prior to their sale; No, for the remaining animals, because they were not clearly held for breeding and appeared to be part of the sale herd.

Court's Reasoning

The court stated that whether an animal is held for breeding purposes is a question of fact. While actual use is the best indication, it is not conclusive. The court applied the legal rule that the taxpayer's declaration of holding an animal for breeding purposes must be supported by their treatment of the animal in the course of everyday operations to report the gain on the sale of the animal as capital gain rather than ordinary income. The court examined the Moores' operations, finding they had two distinct phases: sale of cattle and the breeding herd. Although the Moores claimed animals in the replacement herds were part of the breeding herd, the court found the classification and treatment of the replacement animals did not fully support this. The Court emphasized that the major portion of the Moores' annual income was from selling breeding cattle, which was their principal occupation. The court noted the special care given to replacement animals was to increase sale value. The court found, therefore, the sale of the cattle was the primary business, with the breeding herd existing to produce quality sale animals. However, the court recognized some animals were demonstrably held for breeding based on their use in exhibitions or as herd sires, thus entitling the Moores to capital gains for those specific animals.

Practical Implications

This case provides a critical framework for distinguishing between capital assets and inventory in the context of livestock sales. Attorneys and tax professionals should consider:

- The primary business of the taxpayer: Is it raising for sale, or raising and retaining for breeding purposes?
- The taxpayer's treatment of the animals: How are they fed, housed, and managed? Are there separate herds for breeding and sale?
- Record-keeping: Are separate records maintained for animals held for breeding?
- Advertising and marketing: Does the taxpayer advertise the sale of breeding stock?
- Consistency: Is the taxpayer's behavior consistent with the claimed intent to hold animals for breeding?
- This case highlights the importance of substantiating the claimed breeding purpose with objective evidence.
- Later cases have cited this case in disputes concerning cattle and other types

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

of livestock

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.