Ransburg Corporation and Subsidiaries v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 72 T. C. 271 (1979)

Corporate patent transfers do not qualify for the exception to imputed interest under section 483(f)(4) unless the transferor is a 'holder' as defined in section 1235(b).

Summary

Ransburg Corporation sold its Japanese patents to Ransburg Japan Ltd. in 1963, receiving payments over several years without stated interest. The corporation claimed these payments as long-term capital gains, but the IRS recharacterized a portion as interest under section 483(a). The central issue was whether Ransburg could avoid imputed interest under the section 483(f)(4) exception, which applies to transfers described in section 1235(a). The Tax Court held that since Ransburg was not a 'holder' under section 1235(b), it did not qualify for the exception, and thus, the deferred payments were subject to imputed interest.

Facts

Ransburg Corporation, an Indiana corporation, sold its Japanese patents, patent applications, and trademarks to Ransburg Japan Ltd. in 1963 for a total of Y1,850 million, payable in installments. The sales agreement did not specify any interest on the deferred payments. Ransburg reported the annual payments received as long-term capital gains. The IRS, however, determined that a portion of these payments constituted unstated interest under section 483(a) and should be taxed as ordinary income.

Procedural History

Ransburg filed a petition with the United States Tax Court challenging the IRS's determination. The Tax Court was tasked with deciding whether the payments were exempt from imputed interest under section 483(f)(4). The case involved no prior judicial decisions at lower courts, making it a case of first impression for the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Ransburg Corporation's sale of its Japanese patents qualifies for the exception to imputed interest under section 483(f)(4) despite not being a 'holder' as defined in section 1235(b).

Holding

1. No, because Ransburg Corporation, as a corporation, does not meet the definition of a 'holder' under section 1235(b), which limits holders to certain individuals, thus its transfer does not qualify for the exception under section 483(f)(4).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court analyzed the interplay between sections 483 and 1235. Section 483(f)(4) provides an exception to the imputed interest rule for transfers described in section 1235(a), which requires the transferor to be a ‘holder’ as defined in section 1235(b). Since Ransburg was a corporation and not an individual, it could not be a ‘holder’ under section 1235(b). The court rejected Ransburg’s argument that only section 1235(a) should apply for the purpose of section 483(f)(4), emphasizing that section 1235(b) is integral to the definition of a transfer described in section 1235(a). The court also cited prior judicial interpretations in similar cases, particularly the Court of Claims’ decision in Busse v. United States, which supported the necessity of the transferor being a ‘holder’ under section 1235(b) to qualify for the section 483(f)(4) exception. The court concluded that Ransburg’s transfer did not qualify for the exception, and thus, the deferred payments were subject to imputed interest under section 483(a).

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that corporate patent transfers do not benefit from the exception to imputed interest under section 483(f)(4), as corporations cannot be ‘holders’ under section 1235(b). Practitioners advising on patent sales must consider this when structuring deferred payment agreements for corporate clients. The ruling reinforces the importance of the ‘holder’ definition in section 1235(b) and its impact on tax treatment under related sections. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling, and it has influenced how attorneys draft patent sale agreements to address potential tax liabilities from imputed interest. Businesses selling patents must account for potential ordinary income from imputed interest on deferred payments, affecting their financial planning and tax strategies.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.