

### **33 T.C. 878 (1960)**

When a dairy farmer uses the farm price method for inventory valuation, the basis for determining gain or loss on the sale of dairy animals is the last inventory value, not zero.

#### **Summary**

The case concerns the tax treatment of the sale of dairy cows by a partnership. The partnership used the “farm price method” for inventory valuation and sought to report the sale of culled cows as a long-term capital gain with a zero basis. The Commissioner determined that the cows had a basis equal to their inventory value and that the sale resulted in an ordinary loss. The Tax Court agreed with the Commissioner, ruling that the inventory value, not zero, constituted the basis for determining gain or loss. The court emphasized the consistency required when using an inventory method and rejected the partnership’s attempt to deviate from this method.

#### **Facts**

J. Clifford and Frank W. Gibbs were partners in a dairy farm. The partnership used an accrual method of accounting, including dairy cows in its inventory, and valued its inventory using the “farm price method.” In 1953, the partnership culled and sold 40 dairy cows held for more than 12 months because they were no longer useful for dairy purposes. The inventory value of the cows was \$13,000. The partnership reported the sale as a capital transaction, using a zero basis for the cows, and claimed a long-term capital gain. The Commissioner determined that the basis for the cows was \$13,000, resulting in an ordinary loss, and required the removal of \$13,000 from the opening inventory.

#### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in the partners’ income taxes, disallowing the capital gain treatment and instead determining an ordinary loss based on the inventory value of the cows. The Gibbses contested the Commissioner’s determination in the United States Tax Court.

#### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether the partnership’s basis for the 40 dairy cows sold in 1953 was zero, as claimed by the partners.
2. Whether the sale of the cows resulted in a long-term capital gain.
3. Whether the \$13,000 inventory value of the cows should be removed from the opening inventory.

## **Holding**

1. No, because the basis for the cows was the last inventory value, which was \$13,000.
2. No, because the sale resulted in an ordinary loss due to the basis exceeding the sale price, and the partnership did not realize any gains from the sale of capital assets in that year.
3. Yes, because the opening inventory value of \$13,000 for the cows should be eliminated to avoid a double deduction.

## **Court's Reasoning**

The court determined that the partnership, having elected to use the farm price method, was required to use it consistently in computing gain or loss from the sale of its dairy animals. The court cited Section 113(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code, which states that the basis of property included in inventory is the last inventory value. The court held that the inventory value of \$13,000, not zero, was the basis for calculating the loss. The court found that the cows met the definition of “property used in the trade or business.” Because the partnership had a loss, the court held that the loss could not be considered a loss from the sale of capital assets, as per Section 117(j)(2). The court also reasoned that eliminating the \$13,000 inventory value from the opening inventory was necessary to prevent a double deduction. The court distinguished the case from *Scofield v. Lewis*, which involved a different inventory valuation method and fact pattern.

## **Practical Implications**

This case highlights the importance of adhering to the chosen inventory method for tax purposes. Dairy farmers and other taxpayers using inventory valuation methods must understand that the inventory value, rather than a potentially lower market value or zero basis, will typically determine the gain or loss upon the sale of inventory items. This principle has wide applicability where consistent accounting practices are required. In the context of tax planning, it underscores the need to consider the implications of inventory valuation methods and the tax consequences of sales of inventory, especially when the taxpayer is utilizing the farm-price method. Later courts, when faced with similar factual circumstances, will likely turn to this case to determine the proper tax treatment of the sale of inventory items.