McShain v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 998 (1979)

A note's fair market value may be deemed unascertainable for tax purposes if there is no reliable market for the note and its underlying collateral is speculative.

Summary

In McShain v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that a $3 million second leasehold mortgage note had no ascertainable fair market value in 1970. John McShain sold his leasehold interest in the Philadelphia Inn, receiving a portion of the payment in the form of this note. The court found that due to the note's lack of marketability and the speculative nature of the underlying collateral, its value could not be determined. This decision affects how similar transactions are treated for tax purposes, particularly regarding the recognition of gain under section 1001 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Facts

John McShain received a condemnation award for his Washington property in 1967 and elected to defer recognition of gain under section 1033(a)(3) by reinvesting in the Philadelphia Inn. In 1970, McShain sold his leasehold interest in the Philadelphia Inn to City Line & Monument Corp. for $13 million, part of which was a $3 million second leasehold mortgage note. The Philadelphia Inn had been operating at a loss and faced competition. Both parties presented expert testimony on the note's value, but the court found the note had no ascertainable fair market value due to the speculative nature of the collateral and lack of a market for the note.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in McShain's Federal income taxes for 1967, 1969, and 1970. Most issues were settled, but the remaining issue was whether the second leasehold mortgage note had an ascertainable fair market value in 1970. The Tax Court heard the case and ruled on the issue of the note's value.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $3 million second leasehold mortgage note had an ascertainable fair market value in 1970 for purposes of determining gain under section 1001 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the note lacked a reliable market and the underlying collateral was too speculative to determine its value.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Tax Court applied the legal rule that the fair market value of a note must be ascertainable to determine the amount realized under section 1001(b). The court analyzed the facts, including the Philadelphia Inn's poor financial performance, the lack of a market for the note, and the speculative nature of the collateral. Both parties presented expert testimony, but the court found the Commissioner's experts' income analysis too speculative. The court also noted that the note's lack of marketability was confirmed by experts in the field. The decision was influenced by policy considerations of ensuring accurate tax reporting while recognizing the challenges of valuing certain types of assets. The court quoted precedent stating that only in rare and extraordinary circumstances is property considered to have no ascertainable fair market value.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how taxpayers report gains from transactions involving notes with uncertain value. When a note's value cannot be reliably determined, the transaction remains open, and gain recognition is deferred until payments are received. This ruling guides attorneys in advising clients on the tax treatment of similar transactions and the importance of establishing a note's marketability and the reliability of its underlying collateral. It also influences how the IRS assesses the value of notes in tax audits. Later cases may reference McShain when addressing the valuation of notes in tax disputes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.