Fawick v. Comm'r, 52 T. C. 104 (1969)

Payments for an exclusive patent license that includes future improvements are treated as capital gains under Section 1235 even if the original patent has expired.

Summary

Thomas L. Fawick and his wife Marie assigned exclusive rights to use their patented Airflex clutch for marine purposes to Falk Corp. The original patents expired, but Falk continued to use an unexpired improvement patent owned by Fawick. The IRS argued that post-expiration payments were ordinary income, not capital gains. The Tax Court held that because the license agreement included future improvements, and those improvements were still patented and in use, payments made for their use qualified as capital gains under Section 1235. This ruling clarifies that exclusive licenses for specific uses and future improvements can be considered a transfer of all substantial rights to a patent, justifying capital gains treatment.

Facts

In 1937, Thomas L. Fawick granted Falk Corp. an exclusive license to use his patented Airflex clutch for marine purposes and a nonexclusive license for other uses. The agreement also covered any future improvements on the patents. Fawick later assigned part of his rights to his wife, Marie. By the tax years in question (1961-1963), the original patents had expired, but Falk was still using an improvement patent issued to Fawick in 1953. Falk made payments to Marie Fawick for these years, which the IRS treated as ordinary income. The taxpayers claimed these payments were capital gains under Section 1235.

Procedural History

The taxpayers filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court after the IRS determined deficiencies in their income taxes for 1961, 1962, and 1963, treating the payments from Falk as ordinary income. Most issues were settled by agreement, leaving only the classification of the payments under Section 1235 for decision.

Issue(s)

1. Whether payments received by Marie Fawick from Falk Corp. for the use of the Airflex clutch for marine purposes, based on an exclusive license that included future improvements, constituted long-term capital gain under Section 1235 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the exclusive license to use the Airflex clutch for marine purposes, which included future improvements, constituted a transfer of all substantial rights to the patent under Section 1235, even though the original patents had expired.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court found that the agreement between Fawick and Falk Corp. was clear in its intent to include future improvements, as evidenced by the language “any improvement thereon that may be owned, controlled, or subject to licensing by Fawick. ” The court cited previous cases such as *Heil Co.* to support the notion that an agreement to transfer future inventions is valid and that payments for the use of an unexpired improvement patent under such an agreement are capital gains. The court rejected the IRS’s argument that the payments were for services or that the license was limited to a specific field of use, thus not qualifying for capital gains treatment. The court also invalidated a regulation that contradicted its interpretation of Section 1235.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for patent licensing and tax planning. It allows for capital gains treatment of payments from exclusive licenses that include future improvements, even if the original patent has expired. This ruling encourages inventors to include future improvements in licensing agreements to secure more favorable tax treatment. It also impacts how businesses structure patent licensing agreements, particularly in industries where continuous innovation is common. Subsequent cases, such as *Vincent B. Rodgers*, have followed this precedent, affirming the validity of exclusive licenses for specific uses and future improvements under Section 1235.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.