***Adam v. Commissioner, 60 T. C. 996 (1973)***

Real estate transactions are not considered a trade or business when they are infrequent, passive, and primarily for investment purposes.

**Summary**

Robert Adam, a successful accountant, purchased 11 and sold 9 parcels of undeveloped land over four years, intending to profit from their appreciation. The IRS argued these sales were part of a business, subjecting the gains to ordinary income tax. The U. S. Tax Court disagreed, ruling that Adam's activities were investment-based rather than a trade or business. The decision hinged on the lack of frequency, continuity, and active involvement in the sales, as well as the properties being held primarily for appreciation and sold when profitable. This case clarifies the distinction between real estate investments and business activities for tax purposes.

**Facts**

Robert Adam, a certified public accountant and managing partner at Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. , engaged in real estate transactions from 1966 to 1969. He purchased 11 parcels of undeveloped waterfront land in Maine, anticipating their appreciation in value. Over these four years, he sold 9 of these parcels, realizing significant profits. Adam did not advertise or actively solicit buyers; instead, sales were initiated by potential purchasers or their brokers. He did not improve or subdivide the properties, and his real estate activities were intermittent and did not involve significant time or effort.

**Procedural History**

The IRS determined deficiencies in Adam's federal income taxes for 1967, 1968, and 1969, treating the gains from his real estate sales as ordinary income. Adam petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, arguing that the properties were capital assets and the gains should be taxed as capital gains. The Tax Court ruled in favor of Adam, holding that his real estate activities did not constitute a trade or business.

**Issue(s)**

1. Whether Robert Adam was engaged in the trade or business of buying and selling real estate under section 1221(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

**Holding**

1. No, because Adam's real estate activities were characterized by infrequent and sporadic transactions, passive involvement, and a focus on investment rather than business operations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

## Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied a multi-factor test to determine if Adam’s activities constituted a trade or business, focusing on the purpose of acquisition, frequency and continuity of sales, activities in improvement and disposition, extent of improvements, proximity of sale to purchase, and purpose during the taxable year. The court found that Adam’s primary purpose was to invest in properties that would appreciate over time, selling them when a satisfactory profit could be realized. The sales were not frequent or continuous enough to be considered business operations. Adam did not engage in activities to enhance the properties’ value or actively market them for sale. The court emphasized that Adam’s real estate income was a small fraction of his accounting income, and his involvement in real estate was minimal compared to his primary occupation. The court distinguished Adam’s case from others where taxpayers were deemed to be in the real estate business due to more active involvement and frequent transactions.

## Practical Implications

This decision provides guidance on distinguishing between investment and business activities in real estate for tax purposes. Taxpayers who engage in occasional real estate transactions with the goal of profiting from appreciation, without actively developing or marketing the properties, are likely to be treated as investors rather than dealers. This ruling affects how tax professionals should advise clients on structuring their real estate transactions to achieve capital gains treatment. It also impacts the IRS’s approach to auditing real estate transactions, requiring a thorough analysis of the taxpayer’s level of activity and intent. Subsequent cases have cited Adam v. Commissioner to support similar distinctions, influencing the development of tax law in this area.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 