Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. v. Commissioner, 65 T. C. 847 (1976)

When selling partnership assets, the excess of sale price over book value should be allocated to tangible assets like machinery and equipment, not to goodwill or deferred sales, for tax purposes.

Summary

Upon dissolution, two partners sold their partnership's assets to a corporation which continued the business. The key issue was whether the excess of the sale price over the book value should be attributed to goodwill or deferred sales, or to tangible assets. The court held that no goodwill or deferred sales were included in the sale, and the excess was allocable to machinery and equipment. Consequently, the gain from the sale was treated as ordinary income under sections 735(a)(1) and 751(c), effecting recapture of depreciation under section 1245, and one partner was liable for additional tax under section 47 for investment credit recapture.

Facts

Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. was a partnership operated by Wilmot Fleming, his son Wilmot E. Fleming, and another son, William M. B. Fleming. In March 1968, the partnership dissolved, and Wilmot and Wilmot E. sold their partnership assets to a newly formed corporation, Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. , for $410,000. The sale price exceeded the book value of the assets by $98,786. 85. The partnership did not have a product line, trademarks, or patents, and its business was increasingly competitive. The corporation continued the business using the same name and location.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in the federal income tax of the petitioners, Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. , Wilmot E. Fleming and his wife, and the estate of Wilmot Fleming. The Tax Court consolidated the cases and addressed whether the excess sale price should be allocated to goodwill or tangible assets. The court ruled in favor of the Commissioner in the cases of Wilmot E. Fleming and the estate of Wilmot Fleming, and the case of Wilmot Fleming Engineering Co. was to be decided under Rule 155.

Issue(s)

1. Whether any part of the sale price was attributable to goodwill or deferred sales.
2. Whether the excess of the sale price over book value was allocable to machinery and equipment.
3. Whether the partners' gain from the sale was ordinary income under sections 735(a)(1) and 751(c).
4. Whether one partner is liable for additional tax under section 47.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the court found that no goodwill or deferred sales were included in the sale of partnership assets.
2. Yes, because the excess sale price was allocable to machinery and equipment, as their appraised value substantially exceeded book value.
3. Yes, because the gain from the sale was attributable to depreciated machinery and equipment, making it ordinary income under sections 735(a)(1) and 751(c).
4. Yes, because Wilmot E. Fleming realized an investment credit recapture as determined by the Commissioner under section 47.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court analyzed whether goodwill existed among the partnership assets and found that it did not, based on several factors: the absence of specific reference to goodwill in the sale agreements, the nature of the partnership business which lacked a product line or trademarks, and the fact that the partnership’s reputation did not translate into a competitive advantage due to the competitive bidding process. The court also noted that the personal attributes of the partners were not transferable as goodwill. The excess of the sale price over the book value was attributed to the machinery and equipment, as their appraised value exceeded book value, indicating that the partners’ gain was ordinary income under sections 735(a)(1) and 751(c), effectively recapturing depreciation under section 1245. The court’s decision was influenced by the absence of evidence supporting the allocation to goodwill or deferred sales and the tangible nature of the assets involved.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how similar cases should be analyzed by emphasizing the importance of properly allocating sale proceeds among tangible assets rather than assuming goodwill or deferred sales. Legal practitioners should be cautious in structuring asset sales to ensure that any excess over book value is correctly attributed, especially in cases involving depreciated assets. Businesses involved in asset sales should be aware that the tax treatment of gains can significantly affect their tax liabilities, particularly in terms of depreciation recapture and investment credit recapture. This ruling has been applied in later cases to reinforce the principle that without clear evidence of goodwill, the excess sale price is more likely to be allocated to tangible assets.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.