Ciba-Geigy Corp. v. Commissioner, 85 T. C. 172 (1985)

A 10% royalty rate was upheld as an arm's-length consideration for exclusive rights to manufacture and sell patented herbicides in the U. S.

Summary

Ciba-Geigy Corporation (Ardsley), a U. S. subsidiary of Swiss-based Ciba-Geigy Ltd. , entered into licensing agreements to manufacture and sell triazine herbicides in the U. S. The Commissioner challenged the 10% royalty rate paid to the parent as excessive under IRC Section 482. The court upheld the 10% rate as arm's-length based on industry norms, DuPont's willingness to pay a similar rate, and the herbicides' projected profitability. However, the court allocated $100,000 to Ardsley for services rendered in developing the herbicides.

Facts

In 1958, Ciba-Geigy Ltd. (Geigy-Basle) granted its U. S. subsidiary, Ciba-Geigy Corporation (Ardsley), the right to manufacture and sell simazine and atrazine herbicides in the U. S. in exchange for a 10% royalty on net sales. These herbicides were developed through a research project initiated by Geigy-Basle in 1951. Ardsley conducted parallel testing and obtained U. S. label registration for the herbicides. From 1958 to 1969, Ardsley paid royalties totaling $55. 8 million and earned net profits of $231. 2 million from U. S. sales of the herbicides.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued a statutory notice of deficiency in 1977, reducing the allowable royalty rate from 10% to 6% for the years 1965-1969, and later sought to disallow the entire royalty in an amended answer. Ardsley petitioned the Tax Court, arguing the 10% rate was arm's-length and seeking a setoff for a hypothetical 15% rate. The case was tried in 1984, and the Tax Court issued its opinion in 1985.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the 10% royalty payments made by Ardsley to Geigy-Basle for the triazine herbicide licenses were excessive under the arm's-length standard of IRC Section 482.
2. Whether Ardsley's services in developing the herbicides entitled it to a royalty-free license or compensation for those services.

Holding

1. No, because the 10% royalty rate was consistent with what an unrelated party would have paid under similar circumstances, considering industry norms, DuPont's offers, and the herbicides' profitability.
2. No, because Ardsley's services were largely duplicative and would not have

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

warranted compensation from an unrelated party. However, the court allocated $100,000 to Ardsley as a setoff against royalties for its contribution to the herbicide development.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the arm’s-length standard under IRC Section 482 and Treasury Regulation 1. 482-2(d), which focuses on the amount an unrelated party would pay for similar intangible property under similar circumstances. The court considered DuPont’s offer of a 10-12. 5% royalty for nonexclusive rights, the triazines’ projected and actual profitability, and industry royalty norms of 3-6% for exclusive licenses. The court rejected the Commissioner’s argument that Ardsley and Geigy-Basle had a joint research agreement, finding Geigy-Basle was the primary developer. Ardsley’s parallel testing was duplicative but warranted a $100,000 allocation for services rendered.

Practical Implications

This decision provides guidance on determining arm’s-length royalty rates for transfers of intangible property between related parties. Practitioners should consider industry norms, offers from unrelated parties, and the profitability of the licensed property when negotiating or evaluating royalty rates. The case also illustrates that duplicative services by a licensee may not warrant compensation but could merit a modest allocation if they contribute to the licensed property’s development. Subsequent cases have applied this analysis to similar transfer pricing disputes, emphasizing the importance of considering all relevant facts and circumstances in determining an arm’s-length rate.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.