Stromsted v. Commissioner, 53 T. C. 330 (1969)

Payments made by a franchisee to predecessor franchisees for the right to operate in a franchise territory are capital expenditures, not deductible as royalties or amortizable as intangible assets.

Summary

Victor E. and Helen A. Stromsted, operating as a Dale Carnegie franchisee, made payments to their predecessors as part of acquiring the franchise territories. The Tax Court ruled that these payments were capital expenditures for obtaining the franchise, not deductible as royalties or amortizable under Section 167 due to the indeterminate useful life of the franchise licenses. The court emphasized that the payments were not a retained income interest of the predecessors but part of the cost Stromsted paid to Dale Carnegie for the franchise rights.

Facts

Stromsted became a Dale Carnegie franchisee, operating in 34 counties in New York. As part of the franchise acquisition, Stromsted made payments to three predecessor sponsors: the Michels, Metzler, and Herman. These payments were structured as percentages of future revenues from the franchise territories, with ceilings based on historical performance. Dale Carnegie required these payments as a condition for granting the franchise licenses to Stromsted, who in turn sought to deduct them as royalties on his tax returns.

Procedural History

The IRS disallowed Stromsted’s deductions for these payments, classifying them as capital expenditures. Stromsted petitioned the Tax Court, initially arguing the payments were amortizable intangible assets, then later asserting they constituted retained income interests of the predecessors. The Tax Court ultimately held for the Commissioner, affirming the payments were capital expenditures.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payments made by Stromsted to his predecessors constituted a retained income interest of those predecessors.
2. Whether these payments were amortizable or depreciable under Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the payments were part of the cost Stromsted incurred to acquire the franchise licenses from Dale Carnegie, not an income interest retained by the predecessors.
2. No, because the franchise licenses had an indeterminate useful life, making them

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

ineligible for amortization or depreciation under Section 167.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the payments were not a retained income interest because they were enforceable against Dale Carnegie, not Stromsted, and were part of the franchise acquisition cost. The court applied the principle that income is taxed to the party who earned it, concluding that Stromsted, not the predecessors, earned the income from operating the franchises. The court also cited Section 1. 167(a)-3 of the Income Tax Regulations, which disallows amortization or depreciation for intangible assets with indeterminate useful lives, as the franchise licenses had automatic annual renewal clauses.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that payments made to predecessor franchisees as a condition of franchise acquisition are capital expenditures, not deductible as royalties or amortizable. Franchisees must capitalize these costs and recover them through the franchise’s income over time. The ruling may impact how franchise agreements are structured and how franchisees plan their tax strategies. It also underscores the importance of understanding the tax treatment of franchise acquisition costs, particularly in industries where franchise territories are frequently bought and sold.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.