33 T.C. 451 (1959)

Gains from the sale of pelts taken from breeder foxes are eligible for capital gains treatment under Internal Revenue Code section 117(j) even if the foxes are removed from the breeding group before the pelts are taken, but depreciation deductions are not allowed if the foxes are included in inventory.

Summary

The case concerns a fur fox ranching business, Herbert A. Nieman & Co., and its federal income tax liability. The court addressed three main issues. Firstly, it decided that gains from selling pelts from breeder foxes qualify for capital gains treatment under I.R.C. § 117(j). Secondly, the court determined that Nieman & Co. was not entitled to depreciation deductions for its breeder foxes, as it had elected to treat them as inventory. Lastly, the court ruled that the liquidation of a related company, Ozaukee Fur Farms Company, did not result in a deductible loss for Nieman & Co. due to the applicability of I.R.C. § 112(b)(6).

Facts

Herbert A. Nieman & Co. (the taxpayer) was a Wisconsin corporation engaged in fur fox ranching. The taxpayer designated certain foxes as breeders, which were used to produce annual crops. When breeder foxes were replaced or were no longer used for breeding, they were pelted. The taxpayer reported gains from the sale of breeder fox pelts as ordinary income, not as capital gains. The taxpayer included breeder foxes in its inventory and did not claim depreciation deductions. Ozaukee Fur Farms Company (Ozaukee), a company primarily owned by the taxpayer, underwent liquidation. The taxpayer claimed a loss from its investment in Ozaukee, which the IRS disallowed.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the taxpayer’s income and excess profits taxes. The taxpayer claimed overpayments. The parties resolved some issues by stipulation. The U.S. Tax Court considered three remaining issues: (1) the tax treatment of gains from breeder fox pelt sales, (2) depreciation deductions for breeder foxes, and (3) the deductibility of the loss from the Ozaukee liquidation.

Issue(s)

1. Whether amounts received by petitioner upon the sale of pelts taken from breeder foxes qualify for capital gains treatment under I.R.C. § 117(j).
2. Whether petitioner is entitled to deductions for depreciation upon breeder foxes on hand during each of the years 1942 through 1945.
3. Whether the dissolution of Ozaukee Fur Farms Company, of which petitioner was the principal stockholder, resulted in a loss deductible by petitioner in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1941.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court followed prior case law holding that the pelts from the breeder foxes were treated as capital gains.
2. No, because the taxpayer elected to include the breeder foxes in inventory, and therefore, was not entitled to depreciation deductions under applicable regulations.
3. No, because the court determined that the liquidation of Ozaukee had begun before January 1, 1936; therefore, the nonrecognition provisions of I.R.C. § 112(b)(6) applied.

Court’s Reasoning

Regarding the first issue, the court relied on *Ben Edwards*, 32 T.C. 751, and *United States v. Cook*, 270 F.2d 725, which held that the sale of pelts from breeder mink qualified for capital gains treatment. The court stated, "Both cases held that the taxpayers were entitled to capital gains treatment of the proceeds from the sale of pelts taken from mink held for breeding purposes." The court distinguished this case from one relied upon by the IRS. On the second issue, the court cited Regulations 111, section 29.23(l)-10, which states that if breeding stock is included in inventory, no deduction for depreciation is allowed. The court found that the taxpayer had included the breeder foxes in its inventory and did not claim depreciation deductions; hence, the court upheld the IRS’s determination. The court relied on *Elsie SoRelle*, 22 T.C. 459, which supported the IRS’s decision. On the third issue, the court determined that the liquidation of Ozaukee began after the cutoff date of January 1, 1936. The Court found that the taxpayer had not proven that the liquidation began before this date, even if it took years to conclude. Therefore, I.R.C. § 112(b)(6), which provided for non-recognition of loss, applied.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on the tax treatment of breeder animals. It establishes that the sale of pelts from animals used for breeding can qualify for capital gains treatment, even after the animals are removed from the breeding group. Attorneys representing taxpayers in similar situations should advise clients to report the gains from such sales as capital gains, as the pelts themselves are the final product of the breeding process. However, this holding is contingent on the animal’s classification as a capital asset under I.R.C. § 117(j). This case also highlights the importance of consistent accounting methods. If a taxpayer includes breeding animals in inventory, they cannot claim depreciation deductions. Businesses should carefully choose and consistently apply their accounting methods to maximize tax benefits, particularly in the context of fluctuating animal values and depreciation rules. Moreover, this case underscores the importance of understanding liquidation rules and the timing of liquidation events. A clear plan of liquidation should be adopted early, and actions

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

should be taken to effectuate the plan to ensure the desired tax treatment. Taxpayers should document these actions thoroughly to support their claims in case of disputes with the IRS. Subsequent cases such as *Ben Edwards* and *United States v. Cook* have followed this holding.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.