Maseeh v. Commissioner, 52 T. C. 18 (1969)

Payments for non-compete agreements are taxed as ordinary income unless strong proof shows otherwise.

Summary

Edmond Maseeh sold his wholesale food-distributing business to Pet Milk Co. and entered into a separate non-compete agreement for $50,000. The issue was whether this payment should be taxed as ordinary income or as capital gain from goodwill. The Tax Court held that the payment was for the non-compete agreement, not goodwill, and thus taxable as ordinary income, emphasizing the need for strong proof to overcome the explicit terms of the agreement. The decision highlights the tax treatment of non-compete payments and the evidentiary burden on taxpayers to recharacterize such payments.

Facts

Edmond Maseeh operated Maseeh Distributing Co. , selling snack items in Arizona. In 1963, he sold the business to Pet Milk Co. for $138,677. 37, including inventory, equipment, and accounts receivable. Simultaneously, Maseeh signed a separate non-compete agreement for $50,000, payable in 1963 and 1964, restricting him from competing in Arizona, California, and Nevada for five years or longer. Maseeh reported these payments as long-term capital gains from goodwill on his tax returns, but the Commissioner treated them as ordinary income.

Procedural History

Maseeh and his wife filed joint tax returns for 1963 and 1964 and reported the $50,000 as long-term capital gain. The Commissioner disallowed this treatment and assessed deficiencies. Maseeh petitioned the Tax Court, which held for the Commissioner, determining the payments were for the non-compete agreement and thus ordinary income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $50,000 payments received by Maseeh constituted ordinary income from a non-compete agreement or capital gain from the sale of goodwill?

Holding

1. Yes, because Maseeh failed to provide strong proof that the payments were for goodwill rather than the non-compete agreement as stated in the contract.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the rule that strong proof is required to overcome the stated

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

consideration in a non-compete agreement. Maseeh's testimony that he initially offered to sell his business for $75,000 over and above the value of tangible assets was insufficient to prove the $50,000 was for goodwill. The court noted Maseeh's personal reputation and experience justified the non-compete agreement's business reality. The court also considered Maseeh's understanding of the agreement and his subsequent employment decisions, concluding the payments were for the non-compete agreement. The court cited prior cases requiring strong proof to challenge the tax treatment of such agreements, stating, "It is enough if parties understand the contract and understandingly enter into it. "

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that payments explicitly stated as consideration for non-compete agreements are presumed to be ordinary income unless strong proof establishes otherwise. Attorneys should advise clients on the tax implications of non-compete agreements and ensure clear documentation if any portion of a payment is intended for goodwill. The decision impacts how businesses structure asset sales and non-compete agreements, highlighting the importance of careful allocation of purchase price. Subsequent cases like *Danielson v. Commissioner* further developed the evidentiary standard, making it more challenging for taxpayers to recharacterize such payments without clear evidence of a different intent at the time of the agreement.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.