Johnson v. Commissioner, 53 T. C. 414 (1969)

Payments for the sale of an insurance agency's goodwill and expirations can be treated as capital gains, except for amounts attributable to undercompensated employment services.

Summary

In Johnson v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that payments received by the partners of Frazier & Co. from Aetna Insurance Co. for the sale of their general insurance agency business were largely taxable as capital gains. The court found that Frazier & Co. sold valuable assets, including goodwill and expirations, to Aetna. However, a portion of the payments was reclassified as ordinary income due to the undercompensation of the partners during their subsequent employment with Aetna. This decision underscores the tax treatment of goodwill in business sales and the need to distinguish between asset sales and compensation for services.

Facts

Frazier & Co. , a general insurance agency, sold its business, including expiration data and goodwill, to Aetna Insurance Co. in 1958. The sales price was based on a percentage of premiums generated by Frazier & Co. 's "agency plant" over a 5-year period. Frazier & Co. had approximately 300 local agents and represented multiple insurance companies. Following the sale, the partners of Frazier & Co. became employees of Aetna, receiving a salary of $5,000 each per year, which the court later determined was below market value for their roles.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the partners' income taxes for 1958-1963, asserting that the payments received from Aetna should be taxed as ordinary income rather than capital gains. The case was brought before the U. S. Tax Court, where the partners argued that the proceeds from the sale of their business should be treated as capital gains.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payments received by Frazier & Co. from Aetna upon the sale of its insurance business are taxable as capital gains or ordinary income.
2. Whether any portion of the payments is attributable to the covenant not to compete included in the sale agreement.
3. Whether any portion of the payments is attributable to the employment of Frazier and Johnson by Aetna following the sale.

Holding

1. Yes, because the payments were received upon the sale of valuable assets in the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

nature of goodwill, except for amounts representing undercompensated employment services.
2. No, because the covenant not to compete was not separately bargained for and lacked independent significance apart from the goodwill transfer.
3. Yes, because the partners were undercompensated during their employment with Aetna, and the court adjusted the payments accordingly to reflect ordinary income for those services.

Court’s Reasoning

The court recognized that insurance expirations constitute an intangible asset similar to goodwill, and their sale results in capital gains. It rejected the Commissioner’s argument that Frazier & Co. did not own the expirations, emphasizing the company’s distinct property interest in the agency plant and its valuable relationship with local agents. The court also dismissed the notion that the payments were a substitute for future income, as Aetna was primarily interested in increasing its policy sales, not acquiring commission rights. The covenant not to compete was closely tied to the goodwill sale and did not have independent value. However, the court found that the partners’ salaries were below market value, necessitating an adjustment to account for undercompensated services as ordinary income.

Practical Implications

This decision provides clarity on the tax treatment of goodwill in the sale of insurance agencies, affirming that such assets can be treated as capital gains. It also highlights the importance of accurately valuing employment services in business sale agreements to avoid reclassification of payments as ordinary income. For legal practitioners, this case serves as a reminder to carefully structure and document business sales to distinguish between asset sales and compensation for services. The ruling has been applied in subsequent cases involving the sale of professional practices and other businesses, reinforcing the principles established here regarding the tax treatment of goodwill and the allocation of sale proceeds.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.