Holman v. Commissioner, 66 T. C. 809 (1976)

Payments received by a partner for their interest in partnership receivables upon expulsion are taxable as ordinary income, not capital gains.

Summary

Francis and William Holman were expelled from their law partnership and received payments for their interests in accounts receivable and unbilled services over 18 months. The key issue was whether these payments should be treated as capital gains or ordinary income. The U. S. Tax Court held that these payments were ordinary income under sections 736(a) and 751 of the Internal Revenue Code, as they represented compensation for services rendered. The court also denied the Holmans' claim for a capital loss deduction for the difference between the face value of receivables and the payments received, finding no basis in those receivables.

Facts

Francis and William Holman were partners in a Seattle law firm. On May 13, 1969, they were expelled from the partnership without prior notice. Per the partnership agreement, they received payments for their interests in accounts receivable and unbilled services over an 18-month period. These payments were reported as capital gains on their tax returns, but the Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined they were ordinary income.

Procedural History

The Holmans contested the Commissioner's determination and filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court. They also initiated a lawsuit in Washington state court regarding their expulsion, which was dismissed and affirmed on appeal. The Tax Court proceedings focused solely on the tax treatment of the expulsion payments, with the parties stipulating that the payments were made pursuant to the partnership agreement.

Issue(s)

1. Whether payments received by the Holmans upon their expulsion from the partnership for their interests in accounts receivable and unbilled services should be treated as capital gains or ordinary income under sections 736 and 751 of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the Holmans could deduct as capital losses the difference between the amounts they received and the face value of the partnership's accounts receivable and unbilled services.

Holding

1. No, because the payments were for unrealized receivables and thus constituted

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

ordinary income under sections 736(a) and 751.
2. No, because the Holmans had no basis in the receivables and unbilled services, and therefore could not claim a capital loss deduction.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied sections 736 and 751 of the Internal Revenue Code, which specifically address the tax treatment of payments made in liquidation of a partner’s interest, particularly those related to unrealized receivables. The court noted that the Holmans’ payments were for accounts receivable and unbilled services, which are defined as unrealized receivables under section 751(c). As such, these payments were to be treated as ordinary income, not capital gains. The court cited prior cases and regulations to support its interpretation that these statutory provisions were intended to prevent the conversion of potential ordinary income into capital gains. Regarding the capital loss deduction, the court found that the Holmans had no basis in the receivables and unbilled services because they had not included these amounts in their taxable income previously. Therefore, they could not claim a capital loss.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that payments for a partner’s interest in partnership receivables upon expulsion or retirement are typically treated as ordinary income. Legal practitioners advising clients on partnership agreements should ensure that such agreements align with tax code provisions to avoid unexpected tax liabilities. This case also underscores that anticipated income cannot be claimed as a capital loss if not realized, which is a critical consideration in partnership dissolutions or expulsions. Subsequent cases have followed this ruling, reinforcing the distinction between ordinary income and capital gains in partnership liquidations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.