Honeywell Inc. and Subsidiaries, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 87 T. C. 624 (1986)

A taxpayer can treat sales of leased computers as ordinary retirements under the Class Life Asset Depreciation Range (CLADR) system if the property is treated as depreciable under the regulations.

Summary

Honeywell Inc. leased and sold computers, reporting depreciation under the CLADR system. The IRS argued that these computers were dual-purpose property, not covered by the CLADR regulations, and should be treated as held primarily for sale. The Tax Court, however, ruled in favor of Honeywell, stating that the regulations applied to all retirements from vintage accounts without exception for dual-purpose property. The court also addressed issues regarding original issue discount and bond premium on convertible debentures issued by Honeywell's subsidiary, ruling against Honeywell on both counts.

Facts

Honeywell Inc. and its subsidiary, Honeywell Information Systems Inc. , were engaged in the design, manufacture, sale, and leasing of computers. Honeywell elected to depreciate its leased computers under the CLADR system. When it sold these computers, Honeywell treated the sales as ordinary retirements, crediting the proceeds to the depreciation reserve until the reserve exceeded the vintage account's unadjusted basis. The IRS challenged this treatment, asserting that the computers were dual-purpose property not covered by the CLADR system and that sales proceeds should be recognized immediately as income. Additionally, Honeywell's subsidiary issued debentures convertible into Honeywell stock, raising issues about the amortization of original issue discount and bond premium.

Procedural History

Honeywell filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court after the IRS determined deficiencies in Honeywell's 1976 and 1977 federal income taxes. Both parties moved for partial summary judgment on three issues: (1) the treatment of sales of leased computers under the CLADR system, (2) amortization of original issue discount on convertible debentures, and (3) amortization of bond premium on conversion of debentures. The Tax Court granted Honeywell's motion on the first issue and the IRS's motion on the second and third issues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether sales of leased computers depreciated under the CLADR system constitute ordinary retirements under section 1. 167(a)-11(d)(3), Income Tax Regs.
2. Whether amortizable original issue discount arises on the issuance of debentures by a subsidiary, convertible into stock of its parent, to the extent that the issue price

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

is attributable to the conversion privilege.
3. Whether amortizable bond premium arises upon conversion of debentures, equal to the difference between the fair market value of stock distributed in exchange for the debentures and the face value of the debentures.

Holding

1. Yes, because the regulations apply to all retirements from vintage accounts without exception for dual-purpose property.
2. No, because the conversion feature does not constitute a discount that can be amortized as interest expense.
3. No, because the difference between the fair market value of stock and the face value of the debentures is attributable to the conversion feature, which is not amortizable as bond premium under section 171(b)(1).

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the CLADR regulations were comprehensive and applied to all retirements from vintage accounts, including sales of leased computers. The IRS’s argument that these computers were dual-purpose property and should not be covered by the regulations was rejected, as the regulations did not contain such an exception. On the issue of original issue discount, the court followed precedent that a conversion feature does not create a discount that can be amortized as interest expense. Similarly, on the bond premium issue, the court found that the excess of stock value over the debenture’s face value was attributable to the conversion feature and thus not amortizable under section 171(b)(1). The court emphasized that the IRS could not amend the regulations through a revenue ruling or judicial intervention and that the regulations must be applied as written.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the importance of adhering to the literal terms of tax regulations. Taxpayers can rely on clear regulations to structure their tax reporting, even if the result may seem inconsistent with other tax principles, such as the treatment of dual-purpose property. The ruling also clarifies that conversion features in debentures do not create amortizable original issue discount or bond premium, which is relevant for companies using similar financial instruments. Practitioners should be cautious about relying on revenue rulings to interpret regulations, as such rulings cannot override the regulations themselves. This case may influence future cases involving the interpretation of tax regulations and the treatment of leased property under depreciation systems.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.