Zorniger v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 435 (1974)

The value of stock in a franchised business like an automobile dealership does not include goodwill when the franchise agreement is personal and non-transferable.

Summary

Frank E. Zorniger transferred stock in Ray Bryant Chevrolet to his son via gift and sale. The IRS argued the stock's value should include goodwill, increasing its worth. The Tax Court disagreed, following *Floyd D. Akers*, and ruled that the stock's value was limited to the tangible assets' net fair market value due to the personal and non-transferable nature of the Chevrolet franchise agreement. This decision underscores the lack of goodwill in franchised businesses where the franchise's value can be terminated at the franchisor's discretion, impacting how similar valuations are approached in legal practice.

Facts

Frank E. Zorniger, Sr. , owned all shares of Ray Bryant Chevrolet after the deaths of co-owners in 1965. In 1966, he transferred 860 shares to his son as a gift and sold him 640 shares at $349 each, valuing the stock at the net book value of the dealership's tangible assets. The IRS challenged this valuation, asserting that goodwill should increase the stock's value to $691. 30 per share, later reduced to $500 at trial. The dealership operated under a Chevrolet franchise agreement, which was personal to the named individuals and non-transferable without Chevrolet's approval.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency to Frank and Mary A. Zorniger, asserting a higher value for the transferred stock, including goodwill. The Zornigers petitioned the U. S. Tax Court. At trial, the IRS reduced its valuation but maintained the inclusion of goodwill. The Tax Court issued a decision for the petitioners, affirming the stock's value based solely on tangible assets.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the fair market value of corporate stock in a Chevrolet dealership for gift and sale tax purposes includes goodwill or is limited to the net fair market value of the tangible assets.
2. Whether the burden of proof shifted to the respondent when he asserted a lower fair market value at trial than in his statutory notice of deficiency.

Holding

1. No, because the Chevrolet franchise agreement was personal and non-transferable, precluding any transferable goodwill.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. The court did not decide this issue, as the holding on the first issue rendered it unnecessary.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court followed the precedent set in *Floyd D. Akers*, emphasizing that the value of a franchised business like an automobile dealership depends on the franchise agreement. The court noted that the Chevrolet agreement was personal to the named individuals, could be terminated at Chevrolet’s discretion, and was non-transferable without approval. This made any potential goodwill non-transferable and thus not a factor in the stock’s valuation. The court dismissed the IRS’s expert testimony on valuation, prioritizing the legal nature of the franchise agreement over the expert’s opinion on goodwill. The decision reaffirmed the principle that goodwill cannot be considered in valuing stock when the franchise’s value is contingent on the franchisor’s approval.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that in valuing stock of franchised businesses, attorneys and appraisers must consider whether the franchise agreement allows for the transfer of goodwill. For businesses with personal, non-transferable franchise agreements, valuations should focus solely on tangible assets. This impacts legal practice by emphasizing the need to review franchise agreements carefully when advising clients on business sales or transfers. It also affects business planning, as owners of franchised businesses must understand the limitations on selling their business at a premium due to goodwill. Subsequent cases, such as *Rothgery v. United States*, have upheld this principle, reinforcing its application in similar legal contexts.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.