Tomerlin Trust v. Commissioner, 87 T. C. 876 (1986)

A transfer of a trademark is considered a sale, not a license, if the transferor relinquishes all substantial rights in the trademark, retaining only reasonable safeguards for its integrity.

Summary

In Tomerlin Trust v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court determined that payments received by Cyclo Automotive, Inc. from Accra-Pac, Inc. under a contract involving the trademark 'CYCLO' were proceeds from a sale, not royalties from a license. The court found that Cyclo Automotive had transferred all substantial rights in the trademark to Accra-Pac, retaining only limited rights to safeguard its integrity. Consequently, these payments were classified as ordinary income from the sale of an asset, not as royalties, leading to the conclusion that Cyclo Automotive was not a personal holding company liable for the tax imposed by section 541 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Facts

Cyclo Automotive, Inc. owned the trademark 'CYCLO' used for various automotive products. In 1976, Cyclo Automotive entered into a contract with Accra-Pac, Inc. , granting Accra-Pac exclusive, worldwide rights to use the trademark. The contract required Accra-Pac to make payments to Cyclo Automotive based on the production of products using the trademark. Upon Accra-Pac paying $1 million in total, Cyclo Automotive was obligated to transfer legal title of the trademark to Accra-Pac. Cyclo Automotive retained the right to inspect Accra-Pac's operations for quality control and could terminate the agreement only if Accra-Pac failed to make the required payments. The IRS determined deficiencies in personal holding company tax against Cyclo Automotive, arguing that the payments from Accra-Pac were royalties.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a statutory notice of deficiency to the Tomerlin Trust, transferee of Cyclo Automotive's assets, asserting personal holding company tax liabilities for the years 1979-1982. The Tomerlin Trust petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of these deficiencies. The court heard the case and ultimately ruled in favor of the petitioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payments received by Cyclo Automotive from Accra-Pac under the contract constituted proceeds from the sale of an asset or royalties from a license of the 'CYCLO' trademark.

2. Whether Cyclo Automotive was a personal holding company liable for the tax under section 541 of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the contract between Cyclo Automotive and Accra-Pac was a sale, not a license, of the trademark. Cyclo Automotive transferred all substantial rights to the trademark, retaining only limited rights to safeguard its integrity.

2. No, because the income derived from the sale of the trademark did not constitute royalties, and thus Cyclo Automotive did not meet the income requirements to be classified as a personal holding company.

Court’s Reasoning

The court analyzed the contract to determine if it constituted a sale or a license, focusing on the rights retained by Cyclo Automotive. The court applied the legal principle that if a transferor retains no significant rights or interests in the asset transferred, it is considered a sale. Key factors included the exclusive, worldwide, and perpetual nature of the transfer, the obligation to transfer legal title upon reaching a payment threshold, and the limited rights retained by Cyclo Automotive for quality control and termination only upon non-payment. The court distinguished this case from others where significant rights were retained by the transferor, citing cases like *Kavanagh v. Evans* and *Conde Nast Publications, Inc. v. United States* to support its conclusion. The court also considered the legislative history of section 1253 of the Internal Revenue Code, which deals with transfers of trademarks, but found it did not provide a clear standard for distinguishing between sales and licenses. The court’s decision was influenced by policy considerations to encourage clear delineation of property rights in commercial transactions.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for tax purposes, a transfer of a trademark can be considered a sale if the transferor relinquishes all substantial rights, retaining only reasonable safeguards for its integrity. Legal practitioners should carefully draft trademark transfer agreements to ensure clarity on whether the transaction is intended to be a sale or a license, as this impacts the tax treatment of payments received. Businesses engaging in trademark transfers should consider the tax implications of structuring such agreements as sales to avoid personal holding company tax liabilities. Subsequent cases, such as *Devine v. Commissioner*, have cited Tomerlin Trust to distinguish between sales and licenses of intellectual property, reinforcing its importance in this area of law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.