Thornton v. Commissioner, 51 T. C. 211 (1968)

Section 351 applies to transfers of partnership assets to a corporation when the transfer is part of a preconceived plan to exchange property for stock and securities, and the covenant not to compete must have economic reality to support amortization deductions.

Summary

Thornton and Nye transferred their partnership assets to a newly formed corporation, Delta Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning, Inc. , in exchange for stock and a promissory note. The IRS argued that this transfer fell under Section 351, which would treat the transaction as a non-recognition event, and that the note was an equity interest rather than debt. The Tax Court agreed that Section 351 applied, classifying the note as a security rather than stock, but rejected the corporation's claim for amortization of a covenant not to compete due to its lack of economic substance.

Facts

Thornton and Nye, equal partners in Delta Sheet Metal Co. , decided to incorporate their business to limit personal liability. They formed Delta Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning, Inc. , and transferred the partnership's assets to the corporation on November 1, 1961, in exchange for $4,000 in cash (for stock) and a $73,889. 30 promissory note. Additionally, they executed a covenant not to compete, supported by a $100,000 non-interest-bearing note. The partnership had been successful, with significant sales and net income in the year of transfer.

Procedural History

The IRS determined tax deficiencies against Thornton, Nye, and the corporation, asserting that the asset transfer was governed by Section 351 and that the covenant not to compete lacked economic substance. The case was brought before the Tax Court, which upheld the IRS's position on Section 351 and rejected the amortization of the covenant.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of partnership assets to the corporation falls within the provisions of Code section 351.
2. Whether the corporation is entitled to deductions for amortization of the covenant not to compete.

Holding

1. Yes, because the transfer of cash and business assets to the corporation in exchange for stock and the promissory note was part of a preconceived plan,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

satisfying the requirements of Section 351.
2. No, because the covenant not to compete lacked economic substance and reality, and thus did not support the claimed amortization deductions.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 351, which allows for non-recognition of gain or loss when property is transferred to a corporation in exchange for stock or securities, and the transferors control the corporation post-transfer. The court determined that Thornton and Nye's transfer was part of a single transaction, not a separate sale of assets, based on the timing and interconnectedness of the steps involved. The $73,889. 30 note was classified as a security, not stock, due to its long-term nature and the nature of the debt, which gave Thornton and Nye a continuing interest in the business. Regarding the covenant not to compete, the court found it lacked economic reality because the rights it conferred were already implied by the transfer of goodwill and the fiduciary duties of Thornton and Nye as corporate officers. The court noted that the covenant's enforcement remedies were inadequate, and it appeared to be a device to obtain tax deductions rather than a genuine business agreement.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that Section 351 can apply to transfers of partnership assets to a corporation, even when structured as a sale, if they are part of a larger plan to exchange property for corporate control. It underscores the importance of distinguishing between debt and equity for tax purposes, particularly in closely held corporations. The ruling also sets a precedent for scrutinizing covenants not to compete for their economic substance, requiring them to confer rights beyond those already implied by the transaction or the parties' positions. Legal practitioners should carefully structure such transactions and ensure that covenants have real business purpose to withstand IRS scrutiny. This case has been referenced in later decisions to analyze the application of Section 351 and the validity of covenants not to compete in corporate reorganizations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.