California Federal Life Insurance Co. v. Commissioner, 76 T. C. 107 (1981)

U. S. Double Eagle gold coins are considered property to be valued at fair market value, not money, and their exchange for Swiss francs does not qualify as a like-kind exchange.

Summary

California Federal Life Insurance Co. exchanged Swiss francs for U. S. Double Eagle gold coins and reported a capital loss on its tax return. The Tax Court held that the gold coins were not money but property to be valued at fair market value, resulting in a taxable gain. The court also ruled that the exchange did not qualify as a like-kind exchange under Section 1031(a) due to the differing nature of the properties involved. The decision highlights the distinction between circulating currency and collectible items for tax purposes and clarifies the application of like-kind exchange rules.

Facts

In March 1974, California Federal Life Insurance Co. purchased 110,079. 90 Swiss francs for investment. On March 31, 1975, the company exchanged these Swiss francs for 175 U. S. Double Eagle gold coins. The fair market value of the Swiss francs at the time of exchange was $43,426. 52, while the face value of the gold coins was $3,500. The gold coins had a higher fair market value due to their numismatic and bullion value. On April 3, 1975, the company declared and paid a dividend in these gold coins to its sole shareholder, reporting the dividend at the face value of the coins.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the company's 1975 federal income tax, disallowing the claimed capital loss and asserting a long-term capital gain from the exchange. The company petitioned the United States Tax Court, which ruled in favor of the Commissioner, determining that the U. S. Double Eagle gold coins were property to be valued at fair market value and that the exchange did not qualify as a like-kind exchange.

Issue(s)

1. Whether U. S. Double Eagle gold coins are considered "money" to be valued at face amount or "property" to be valued at fair market value under Section 1001(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the exchange of Swiss francs for U. S. Double Eagle gold coins constitutes a nontaxable like-kind exchange under Section 1031(a).

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the U. S. Double Eagle gold coins are not circulating legal tender and have numismatic value exceeding their face amount, they are considered “property (other than money)” to be valued at their fair market value.
2. No, because the Swiss francs and the U. S. Double Eagle gold coins are not of like kind due to their differing nature and character, the exchange does not qualify as a like-kind exchange under Section 1031(a).

Court’s Reasoning

The court determined that U. S. Double Eagle gold coins were not “money” within the meaning of Section 1001(b) because they were withdrawn from circulation in 1934 and their value exceeded their face amount due to their numismatic and bullion value. The court cited the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 and the Executive Order of 1933, which allowed private ownership of rare and unusual gold coins, indicating that such coins were not intended to be treated as circulating legal tender. The court also noted that the substance of the transaction was the acquisition of valuable property, which should be valued at fair market value. For the like-kind exchange issue, the court applied the standard from *Koch v. Commissioner*, stating that the economic situation of the taxpayer must remain fundamentally the same after the exchange. The court found that the Swiss francs and the gold coins had different natures, as the francs were a circulating medium of exchange and the gold coins were traded by numismatists, thus failing to meet the like-kind requirement.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that rare and collectible coins should be treated as property for tax purposes, valued at their fair market value rather than face value. Taxpayers engaging in similar transactions must recognize any gain based on the difference between the fair market value of the coins and the adjusted basis of the property exchanged. The ruling also underscores that for a like-kind exchange to be valid under Section 1031(a), the properties must be of the same nature and character, not merely personal property. This case impacts how investors and collectors should report gains or losses from transactions involving collectible items and informs legal practice in distinguishing between money and property for tax purposes. Subsequent cases, such as *Cordner v. United States*, have applied this ruling to similar situations involving the valuation of dividends paid in collectible coins.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.