## Holmes v. Commissioner, 52 T. C. 494 (1969)

A promissory note from a third party, even if guaranteed by the purchaser, does not constitute "indebtness of the purchaser" under section 453 of the Internal Revenue Code for installment sale reporting.

### **Summary**

In Holmes v. Commissioner, the taxpayers sold real property and received a third-party promissory note as part of the down payment. The issue was whether this note should be treated as "indebtness of the purchaser" under section 453(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, allowing for installment sale treatment. The Tax Court held that the third-party note did not qualify as the purchaser's indebtedness, even though the purchaser guaranteed its payment, and thus it must be included as income in the year of sale. This ruling reinforces the principle that only direct obligations from the purchaser can be deferred in installment sales.

#### **Facts**

Carl F. and Kathleen E. Holmes sold a 400-acre parcel of land in Calaveras County, California, to F. O. Thomsen for \$100,000 on July 7, 1966. The down payment was \$20,000, which included a third-party promissory note (the Smith note) valued at \$6,385. 72, assigned by Thomsen to the Holmeses. Thomsen also guaranteed the Smith note's payment. The Holmeses elected to report the gain from the sale using the installment method but did not include the Smith note's value as income in their 1966 tax return. The IRS determined a deficiency, arguing the Smith note should be included in the year of sale.

### **Procedural History**

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency to the Holmeses for the 1966 tax year. The Holmeses petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court, in its decision, upheld the IRS's determination that the third-party note must be included as income in the year of sale.

#### Issue(s)

1. Whether a third-party promissory note, guaranteed by the purchaser, constitutes "indebtness of the purchaser" under section 453(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code?

### Holding

1. No, because the third-party note, even with the purchaser's guarantee, does not meet the statutory requirement of being an obligation directly from the purchaser.

## Court's Reasoning

The court applied the legal rule from section 453 of the IRC, which allows for installment sale reporting only if payments received in the year of sale do not exceed 30% of the total sales price and do not include "evidences of indebtedness of the purchaser." The court found that the Smith note was not an obligation of the purchaser, F. O. Thomsen, but rather a third-party obligation from Arthur R. and Ruth M. Smith. The court cited prior cases such as J. W. Elmore, Georgia-Florida Land Co., and Mercedes Frances Freeman, et al., Trust, where third-party notes were similarly treated. The court rejected the Holmeses' argument that the purchaser's guarantee transformed the note into the purchaser's indebtedness, stating that the guarantee was only relevant to the note's valuation. The court emphasized that Congress intended for income to be taxed upon receipt, even if not in cash form, and that the IRC's installment sale provisions were not applicable to third-party notes.

# **Practical Implications**

This decision impacts how installment sales are structured and reported for tax purposes. Taxpayers and their advisors must carefully consider the nature of payments received in sales transactions. If a sale involves third-party notes, even with guarantees from the purchaser, these must be included as income in the year of sale, potentially affecting the tax liability in that year. This ruling reinforces the need for clear and direct obligations from the purchaser to qualify for installment sale treatment under section 453. It also underscores the importance of understanding the nuances of tax law when structuring sales to optimize tax outcomes. Subsequent cases have consistently followed this precedent, ensuring that only direct purchaser obligations are deferred under installment sales.