Cox v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 247 (1974)

For installment method reporting under IRC Section 453(b), the 'selling price' excludes imputed interest under IRC Section 483.

Summary

In Cox v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that for the installment method of reporting under IRC Section 453(b), the 'selling price' does not include interest imputed under IRC Section 483. The case involved Dean and Lavina Cox, who sold their corporate stock with a deferred payment plan. The court determined that because the initial payments exceeded 30% of the adjusted selling price (after subtracting imputed interest), the Coxes could not use the installment method. Additionally, subsequent amendments to the sale contract could not retroactively qualify the transaction for installment reporting.

Facts

Dean W. and Lavina M. Cox owned 50% of Carlos Bay Food Center, Inc. They entered into an agreement on June 27, 1968, to sell their shares back to the corporation for $101,347. 18. The payment included a cash downpayment of $29,390. 68 and a non-interest-bearing promissory note for the balance. The corporation also transferred a one-half interest in a lease-option on real estate to the Coxes. Two years later, the contract was amended to include interest on the deferred balance.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue challenged the Coxes' use of the installment method to report the gain from the stock sale, determining a tax deficiency. The Coxes petitioned the Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner's position that the transaction did not qualify for installment reporting due to the initial payments exceeding 30% of the adjusted selling price and the ineffectiveness of the subsequent contract amendment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the 'selling price' for installment method reporting under IRC Section 453(b) includes interest imputed under IRC Section 483.
2. Whether a contract amendment two years after the sale can retroactively qualify the transaction for installment reporting under IRC Section 453(b).
3. What was the value of the one-half interest in the lease-option received by the Coxes in the year of sale?

Holding

1. No, because the 'selling price' under IRC Section 453(b) does not include interest

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

imputed under IRC Section 483, as established by regulations and prior case law.
2. No, because events occurring after the year of payment cannot change the characterization of payments as interest or principal for the year of sale, per IRC Section 483(e) and regulations.
3. The one-half interest in the lease-option had a fair market value of at least $20 in the year of sale, based on subsequent sale and maintenance costs.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied IRC Section 453(b) and IRC Section 483, following regulations that excluded imputed interest from the ‘selling price’ for installment reporting. The Coxes’ initial payment exceeded 30% of the adjusted selling price, disqualifying them from using the installment method. The court also upheld the regulation preventing retroactive qualification through contract amendments, as this would contradict the statutory framework. The court determined the value of the lease-option based on the Coxes’ subsequent actions and costs associated with it, aligning with prior case law on valuing non-cash assets in installment sales.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that imputed interest under IRC Section 483 must be excluded from the ‘selling price’ when determining eligibility for installment reporting under IRC Section 453(b). Practitioners must carefully calculate the adjusted selling price and ensure initial payments do not exceed the 30% threshold. The ruling also highlights that post-sale amendments cannot retroactively alter the tax treatment of the transaction for the year of sale, emphasizing the importance of precise contract drafting at the outset. This case has influenced subsequent rulings on the installment method and the treatment of interest in sales contracts, reinforcing the need for thorough understanding of tax regulations and timely compliance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.