Estate of Klein v. Commissioner, 37 T.C. 1035 (1962)

A patent transfer that is exclusive within a specific industry constitutes a sale of the patent rights, eligible for capital gains treatment, provided the transferor relinquishes all substantial rights within that industry.

Summary

The Estate of Klein contested the Commissioner's determination that payments received from a patent transfer were taxable as ordinary income, arguing for capital gains treatment. The Tax Court addressed whether the transfer of a patent application's rights limited to the gate valve industry qualified as a sale or a license. The court held that the transfer was a sale of the patent rights because the decedent, by transferring exclusive rights within the gate valve industry, had, in effect, transferred the whole patent rights within the industry. This entitled the estate to capital gains treatment on the payments received.

Facts

The decedent transferred certain nonexclusive rights under a patent application, with the exception of the exclusive rights to make, use, and sell the invention in the gate valve industry. The decedent later filed a further application limited to use in gate valves. The parties subsequently defined the underlying agreement so that the transferee held all the rights in the patent for gate valve manufacturing. The patents themselves were not yet issued during the tax years in question.

Procedural History

The case was brought before the U.S. Tax Court. The Commissioner determined that the payments received from the patent transfer were taxable as ordinary income. The Estate of Klein contested this determination, arguing for capital gains treatment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of exclusive rights under a patent application limited to the gate valve industry constitutes a sale, qualifying for capital gains treatment, or a license, taxable as ordinary income.

Holding

1. Yes, the transfer of exclusive rights under the patent application limited to the gate valve industry constituted a sale, qualifying for capital gains treatment, because the transferor relinquished all substantial rights within that industry.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court referenced the precedent set by *Waterman v. Mackenzie*, 138 U.S. 252 (1891), where the court found that a transfer is an assignment when the patentee transfers all rights in a patent. The court noted that the *Waterman* decision does not require a transfer to a specified area, but that the transfer can be limited by area. In this case, the transfer of rights was exclusive within the gate valve industry. The court distinguished between a transfer of an industry versus a geographical area, holding that it is not necessary to apply the Waterman test strictly when considering an industry-wide transfer. The court found that the taxpayer effectively gave up all substantial rights to make, use, and sell the invention in the gate valve industry. The court reasoned that the transfer included the rights to make, use, and sell, satisfying the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.