Ledoux v. Commissioner, 77 T. C. 293, 1981 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 82 (1981)

A partner's sale of a partnership interest may be partly treated as ordinary income if the sale includes rights to future income from unrealized receivables.

Summary

John Ledoux sold his 25% interest in a partnership that managed a dog racing track for $800,000. The IRS determined that part of the gain should be taxed as ordinary income because it was attributable to unrealized receivables under the partnership's management agreement. The Tax Court agreed, ruling that the partnership's right to future income from managing the track was an unrealized receivable. The court rejected the taxpayer's arguments that the excess gain was due to goodwill or going concern value, holding that the sale price was primarily for the right to future income under the management agreement.

Facts

John Ledoux was a 25% partner in a partnership that managed a greyhound racing track in Florida under a 1955 agreement with the track's owner corporation. The agreement gave the partnership the right to operate the track and receive a portion of the profits in exchange for annual payments to the corporation. In 1972, Ledoux sold his partnership interest to the other two partners for $800,000, calculated based on a multiple of his 1972 earnings from the partnership. The sales agreement stated that no part of the price was allocated to goodwill. Ledoux reported the gain as capital gain on his tax return, but the IRS determined that a portion was ordinary income attributable to the partnership's rights under the management agreement.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency to Ledoux for the tax years 1972-1974, asserting that part of the gain from the sale of his partnership interest should be taxed as ordinary income. Ledoux petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court held a trial and issued its opinion on August 10, 1981, siding with the IRS and determining that a portion of the gain was indeed ordinary income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a portion of the amount received by Ledoux from the sale of his partnership interest is attributable to unrealized receivables of the partnership and thus should be characterized as ordinary income under section 751 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the partnership's right to future income under the management

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

agreement constituted an unrealized receivable, and the excess of the sales price over the value of tangible assets was attributable to this right.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the term “unrealized receivables” under section 751(c) of the IRC includes any contractual right to payment for services rendered or to be rendered, even if the performance of services is not required by the agreement. The court found that the partnership’s management agreement gave it a right to future income in exchange for operating the track, which fit the definition of an unrealized receivable. The court rejected Ledoux’s arguments that the excess gain was due to goodwill or going concern value, noting that the sales agreement explicitly stated no part of the price was allocated to goodwill. The court also found that the sales price was primarily for the right to future income under the management agreement, as evidenced by the method used to calculate it. The court cited several cases, including United States v. Woolsey and United States v. Eidson, which held that similar management contracts constituted unrealized receivables.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that when a partnership interest is sold, any portion of the sales price attributable to the partnership’s rights to future income under a management or similar agreement may be taxed as ordinary income, not capital gain. Taxpayers and their advisors must carefully analyze partnership agreements to determine if they include unrealized receivables. When selling a partnership interest, the allocation of the sales price among the partnership’s assets should be clearly documented, as the court will generally respect an arm’s-length allocation between the parties. This case also highlights the importance of understanding the tax implications of partnership agreements and sales, as the characterization of income can significantly impact the tax liability of the selling partner. Later cases have continued to apply this principle, requiring careful analysis of partnership assets and agreements in similar situations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.