Mathers v. Commissioner, 57 T. C. 666 (1972)

The transfer of installment notes with recourse to a finance company constitutes a sale or disposition for tax purposes, requiring the immediate recognition of gain under IRC § 453(d).

Summary

John B. Mathers, a furniture dealer, transferred installment notes to Mason Plan Co. under a 'Master Agreement' that allowed him to receive immediate payment after a discount and reserve were withheld. The IRS argued that these transfers were sales, not loans, thus Mathers should recognize the full gain in the year of transfer under IRC § 453(d). The Tax Court agreed, finding that Mathers relinquished substantial ownership rights in the notes, treating the transaction as a sale. Additionally, the court held that unremitted sales taxes collected by Mathers were taxable income in the year collected, as he exercised control over these funds.

Facts

John B. Mathers operated a furniture business and sold goods on credit, securing payments through installment notes. In 1964, Mathers transferred these notes to Mason Plan Co. under a 'Master Agreement' which stated the notes were assigned and discounted with recourse. Mathers received the face amount of the notes minus a discount and a reserve held by Mason Plan Co. He continued to collect payments from customers on behalf of Mason Plan Co. and was liable if customers defaulted. Additionally, Mathers collected state and local sales taxes but only remitted a portion to the authorities.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in Mathers' income tax for 1961, 1962, and 1964, asserting that the transfer of installment notes to Mason Plan Co. constituted a sale under IRC § 453(d), and that unremitted sales taxes were taxable income. Mathers contested these determinations before the Tax Court, which upheld the IRS's position on both issues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of installment notes by Mathers to Mason Plan Co. in 1964 constituted a sale or disposition under IRC § 453(d)?
2. Whether Mathers realized taxable income in 1964 from unremitted state and local sales taxes collected during that year?

Holding

1. Yes, because Mathers relinquished substantial ownership rights in the notes by transferring them to Mason Plan Co. , which had exclusive control over the notes,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

indicating a sale rather than a loan.
2. Yes, because the unremitted sales taxes collected by Mathers in 1964 were under his control and constituted taxable income in that year.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied IRC § 453(d), which requires the recognition of gain upon the disposition of installment obligations. It found that Mathers transferred the substantial incidents of ownership in the notes to Mason Plan Co. , as evidenced by the 'Master Agreement' and the practice of Mathers collecting payments on behalf of Mason Plan Co. The court distinguished this case from others where notes were clearly used as collateral for loans, emphasizing the absence of any evidence of a loan agreement or personal liability for amounts received. For the sales tax issue, the court relied on the principle that income is taxable when a taxpayer has control over funds, referencing *James v. United States*, and concluded that unremitted sales taxes were taxable income when collected.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that transferring installment notes with recourse to a third party can be treated as a sale for tax purposes, requiring immediate gain recognition under IRC § 453(d). Businesses that use similar financing arrangements should be aware that they may not defer income recognition under the installment method. Furthermore, the ruling underscores that unremitted sales taxes can be considered taxable income in the year collected if the taxpayer exercises control over them. This may impact business practices regarding the collection and remittance of sales taxes. Subsequent cases have cited Mathers for these principles, notably in distinguishing between sales and secured loans and in the treatment of unremitted taxes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.