Freeport Transport, Inc. v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 107 (1974)

The IRS is not bound by contractual allocations between purchase price and compensation for services when determining tax treatment.

Summary

Freeport Transport, Inc. purchased a trucking business from Albert Curcio, agreeing to pay $35,000, allocated as $10,000 for the business and $25,000 for Curcio's services over two years. The IRS reallocated $20,000 of the second year's payment as purchase price. The Tax Court, bound by Third Circuit precedent, held that the IRS was not bound by the contract's allocation. The court determined that $10,000 of the payments were for services, with the remainder as purchase price, emphasizing substance over form when both parties are before the court.

Facts

Freeport Transport, Inc. purchased a trucking business from Albert Curcio, including certificates of public convenience and goodwill. The purchase agreement provided for a total payment of $35,000, allocated as $10,000 for the business itself, $5,000 for services in the first year, and $20,000 for services in the second year. Freeport was inexperienced in hauling acids, a key component of the business, and required Curcio's services to successfully transition. Curcio became ill and died during the second year, performing minimal services after January 1969. Freeport deducted the payments as compensation, while Curcio's estate treated the $20,000 as capital gain from the sale of the business.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies against both Freeport and Curcio's estate, taking inconsistent positions: treating the $20,000 as purchase price for Freeport and as compensation for the estate. The cases were consolidated in the U. S. Tax Court. The court, constrained by Third Circuit precedent, applied the principles from Commissioner v. Danielson, allowing reallocation of the payments.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the IRS is bound by the allocation of payments between purchase price and compensation for services as stated in the contract between Freeport and Curcio.
2. How the $20,000 payment should be allocated between purchase price and compensation for services.

Holding

1. No, because the IRS is not bound by the contractual allocation when determining tax treatment, as established by Commissioner v. Danielson.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. The court allocated $10,000 of the total payments as compensation for services and the remainder as purchase price, based on the substance of the transaction.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the Third Circuit’s Danielson rule, which states that a taxpayer is bound by a contract’s allocation in the absence of mistake, undue influence, fraud, or duress. However, the court distinguished this case from Danielson because both parties to the agreement were before the court and the IRS did not object to varying the contract’s terms. The court found the allocation of $25,000 for services disproportionate to the business’s value and the services actually performed. It determined that $10,000 was a reasonable amount for the services contracted for, with the remainder attributable to the purchase price. The court emphasized the substance of the transaction over its form, as supported by concurring opinions.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how similar transactions should be analyzed for tax purposes. Taxpayers and practitioners must be aware that the IRS can reallocate payments between purchase price and compensation for services, especially when both parties to a transaction are before the court. This ruling may encourage more detailed documentation of services to be performed and their value in business purchase agreements. It also highlights the IRS’s ability to take inconsistent positions to protect the revenue, which may affect negotiation strategies in business transactions. Later cases have followed this approach, emphasizing substance over form in tax allocation disputes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.