Medco Products Co. , Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 62 T. C. 509 (1974)

Legal expenses incurred in trademark infringement litigation to protect a trademark are capital expenditures, not deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Summary

Medco Products Co. sued an Illinois corporation for trademark infringement, successfully obtaining an injunction and nominal damages. The company sought to deduct the legal fees as ordinary business expenses under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court, citing precedent from Danskin, Inc. , held that these expenses were capital in nature, as they enhanced the value of Medco's trademark and provided benefits beyond the year of expenditure. This ruling emphasizes that costs associated with defending or acquiring property rights, such as trademarks, are to be capitalized rather than immediately deducted.

Facts

Medco Products Co. , Inc. , which markets electrical therapeutic equipment, has used the trademark 'Medco' for over 20 years. In 1966, Medco discovered that another company, Medco Hospital Supply Corp. , was using the same trademark. After unsuccessful attempts to resolve the issue, Medco initiated a trademark infringement lawsuit in October 1966. The court found in favor of Medco, issuing a permanent injunction against the use of the 'Medco' trademark by the Illinois corporation and awarding Medco $1,000 in damages. Medco deducted the legal fees incurred during the lawsuit as ordinary and necessary business expenses for the tax years ending November 30, 1967, and November 30, 1968.

Procedural History

Medco Products Co. filed a petition with the United States Tax Court after the Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Medco's income taxes for the years 1967 and 1968, disallowing the deduction of legal expenses related to the trademark infringement lawsuit. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, ruling that the legal expenses were capital expenditures.

Issue(s)

1. Whether legal expenses incurred by Medco Products Co. in a trademark infringement lawsuit are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the legal expenses were capital expenditures, as they enhanced the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

value of Medco’s trademark and provided benefits extending beyond the tax year in which they were incurred.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court relied on its decision in Danskin, Inc. , which established that legal expenses to force another party to abandon a similar or identical trademark are capital in nature. The court rejected Medco’s arguments that Danskin was distinguishable due to the nature of the trademarks involved or the impact on the trademark’s value. The court emphasized that the litigation protected Medco’s trademark, assuring ‘unmolested use’ and permanently eliminating competition, thus enhancing the trademark’s value. The court also dismissed Medco’s contention that Supreme Court decisions like Gilmore and Woodward had effectively overruled Danskin, noting that Danskin did not rely on the ‘primary purpose’ test but rather on the protection of property rights and the longevity of the benefits derived from the litigation.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that legal expenses incurred to defend or enhance trademark rights must be capitalized, not deducted as ordinary business expenses. Businesses must consider the long-term benefits of such litigation when planning their tax strategies. This ruling impacts how companies account for legal costs related to intellectual property, requiring them to spread these costs over the useful life of the asset rather than deducting them immediately. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the principle that costs associated with defending property rights are capital in nature. This case also highlights the importance of understanding the nuances of tax law concerning the classification of legal expenses, particularly in the context of intellectual property.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.