Waldrep v. Commissioner, 52 T. C. 640 (1969)

The assumption of a mortgage by a buyer is treated as a payment for the seller in determining eligibility for installment sale treatment under IRC Section 453.

Summary

In Waldrep v. Commissioner, the Tax Court held that the Waldreps were not entitled to use the installment method for reporting the gain from the sale of land because the buyer, Motels, Inc. , assumed their existing mortgages, which constituted more than 30% of the selling price in the year of sale. The court also determined that the improvements on the land were not sold to the buyer as the sellers retained the right to remove them. This case clarifies that mortgage assumptions must be included in the calculation of payments received in the year of sale, impacting the eligibility for installment reporting.

Facts

The Waldreps owned two adjacent tracts of land in Birmingham, Alabama. They sold one 5-acre tract to Motels, Inc. , for $200,000, with $55,000 paid at closing and the balance due within a week. The sale included an option for the Waldreps to remove the building and improvements within 60 days, which they exercised. The property was subject to a mortgage held by the Exchange Security Bank and additional mortgages held by the Coffeys, which Motels, Inc. , assumed by executing new notes and mortgages for the same amounts.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Waldreps' income taxes for 1962 and 1963, asserting that they received over 30% of the selling price in the year of sale due to the mortgage assumptions, disqualifying them from installment sale treatment. The Waldreps petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the improvements on the land were sold to Motels, Inc. , as part of the transaction.
2. Whether Motels, Inc. , assumed the Waldreps' mortgages, affecting their eligibility to report the sale on the installment method under IRC Section 453.

Holding

1. No, because the Waldreps retained the right to remove the improvements, which they exercised, indicating that the improvements were not part of the sale.
2. Yes, because Motels, Inc. , assumed the mortgages, and under IRC Section 453 and the regulations, the excess of the mortgage amount over the basis of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

property sold is considered a payment received in the year of sale, disqualifying the Waldreps from installment sale treatment.

Court’s Reasoning

The court determined that the improvements were not sold because the Waldreps retained effective control over them and exercised their right to remove them without any rebate or additional consideration. Regarding the mortgage assumption, the court found that Motels, Inc. , became personally liable for the mortgage amount, which constituted an assumption under the tax regulations. The court emphasized that the excess of the mortgage over the land’s basis must be included as a payment received in the year of sale, citing Section 1. 453-4(c) of the Income Tax Regulations. The court rejected the Waldreps’ argument that the mortgage was merely taken subject to, not assumed, by the buyer, as the new liability created was equivalent to an assumption.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of carefully structuring real estate transactions to qualify for installment sale treatment. Sellers must be aware that any mortgage assumption by the buyer will be treated as a payment received in the year of sale, potentially disqualifying them from installment reporting if it exceeds 30% of the selling price. Legal practitioners should advise clients on the implications of mortgage assumptions and the necessity of clearly defining the assets included in the sale. The ruling has been applied in subsequent cases to clarify the treatment of mortgage assumptions in installment sales, impacting how similar cases are analyzed and reported for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.