Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 873 (1975)

Goodwill is not present in a business transaction unless it can be proven by the party claiming it, and its existence is determined by factual analysis.

Summary

In Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether goodwill was transferred in the sale of partnership assets to a corporation. The court found no goodwill existed, ruling that the excess sale price over the book value of the assets was attributable to machinery and equipment, not goodwill or deferred sales. Consequently, the gain was ordinary income, not capital gain, and the corporation's depreciation basis was upheld. The decision underscores the importance of proving goodwill through specific factual evidence and the implications of asset classification for tax purposes.

Facts

Upon dissolution of their partnership, decedent, William, and Wilmot transferred partnership assets to Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. The sale price exceeded the combined basis of these assets by $98,786. 85. The corporation allocated this excess to machinery and equipment, claiming depreciation deductions. Wilmot and the Estate argued the excess represented goodwill, thus capital gain, while the Commissioner asserted it was ordinary income due to the nature of the assets sold.

Procedural History

The case originated in the U. S. Tax Court, where Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. , Wilmot, and the Estate of Wilmot Fleming challenged the Commissioner's determinations regarding the allocation of the sale price and the character of the resulting gain. The Tax Court consolidated these cases and issued a majority opinion addressing the issues of goodwill, asset allocation, and tax treatment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether goodwill was among the assets transferred to Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. upon dissolution of the partnership?
2. Whether the gain from the sale of partnership interests by decedent and Wilmot should be characterized as capital gain?
3. Whether Wilmot realized an investment credit recapture in excess of that reported on his return for 1968?

Holding

1. No, because the court found no evidence of goodwill based on the factual analysis and the absence of specific allocation to goodwill in the agreements.
2. No, because the gain was attributable to depreciated machinery and equipment,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

thus ordinary income under section 735(a)(1).
3. Yes, because the sale of the machinery and equipment triggered an investment credit recapture under section 47.

Court’s Reasoning

The court emphasized that the burden of proving goodwill lies with the party asserting it. It conducted a factual inquiry into whether goodwill existed, considering factors such as the absence of goodwill in written agreements, the lack of specific allocation during negotiations, and the omission of goodwill from the partnership’s and corporation’s books. The court noted that profitability alone does not constitute goodwill and found no evidence of excess earning capacity or competitive advantage attributable to the business itself. The court also compared the sale price to the capitalized earning capacity of the business and the appraised value of the assets, concluding that the excess sale price was attributable to the machinery and equipment. The court rejected the corporation’s later claim that part of the excess should be allocated to deferred sales, as this was not supported by the initial agreements or subsequent actions.

Practical Implications

This decision highlights the importance of clearly documenting and proving the existence of goodwill in business transactions. It affects how businesses should approach asset sales, particularly in terms of tax planning and asset allocation. Practitioners must ensure that any claim of goodwill is supported by specific evidence, as the court will not infer goodwill without substantial proof. The ruling also has implications for depreciation and investment credit recapture, reminding taxpayers to carefully consider the tax consequences of asset classifications. Subsequent cases have cited Wilmot Fleming for its approach to determining goodwill, emphasizing the need for a factual basis in such determinations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.