Sam Goldberger, Inc. v. Commissioner, 88 T. C. 1532 (1987)

Advances from a DISC to its parent company do not qualify as export assets if not used for purchasing export property or if made to a related party.

Summary

Sam Goldberger, Inc. , and its wholly owned subsidiary, Sam Goldberger International, Inc. (International), faced tax disputes with the IRS. International, operating as a Domestic International Sales Corporation (DISC), made advances to its parent, Goldberger, Inc. , to purchase merchandise for export. However, the IRS disqualified International as a DISC for failing to meet the asset test, since the advances did not qualify as export assets. The court upheld the validity of the regulation excluding advances to related parties from qualified export assets and ruled that International did not qualify as a DISC for the taxable year in question. Additionally, the court addressed issues related to salary deductions, inventory valuation, rent deductions, travel expenses, and the sale of a cabin, determining that only the salary deductions were allowable.

Facts

Sam Goldberger, Inc. , operated a meat brokerage business and was the parent company of Sam Goldberger International, Inc. , which elected DISC status. International made advances to Goldberger, Inc. , intended for purchasing merchandise for export, primarily to Japan. However, International’s meat supplier discontinued supply, and the advances were not used to purchase inventory. The IRS disqualified International as a DISC for its taxable year ending October 31, 1979, due to the advances not being qualified export assets. Goldberger, Inc. , also deducted salary paid to Emma Sterner, valued its inventory at the lower of cost or market, claimed rent deductions for using Sterner’s home as an office, and deducted travel and entertainment expenses without proper substantiation. Additionally, Sam Goldberger sold a cabin without reporting the proceeds.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency to Goldberger, Inc. , and Sam Goldberger for various taxable years, challenging the DISC status, salary deductions, inventory valuation, rent deductions, travel and entertainment expenses, and the unreported sale of a cabin. Goldberger, Inc. , filed an amended return and contested the DISC disqualification. The cases were consolidated for trial, briefing, and opinion before the U. S. Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court had jurisdiction to decide if International qualified as a DISC for its taxable year ended October 31, 1979, and if so, whether it qualified as a DISC.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether Goldberger, Inc. , was entitled to a deduction for salary paid to Emma Sterner.
3. Whether Sam Goldberger properly valued the ending inventory of meat products of his sole proprietorship.
4. Whether the sole proprietorship of Sam Goldberger was entitled to deductions for rent.
5. Whether the sole proprietorship of Sam Goldberger was entitled to a deduction for travel and entertainment expenses.
6. Whether the proceeds from the sale of a cabin were includable in the gross income of Sam Goldberger.
7. Whether Goldberger, Inc. , and Sam Goldberger were liable for additions to tax under section 6653(a)(1) and (2).

Holding

1. Yes, because the court had jurisdiction to determine International's DISC status for the taxable year in question, which was necessary to correctly redetermine Goldberger, Inc. 's deficiency for other years. No, because International did not qualify as a DISC due to the advances not being qualified export assets.
2. Yes, because the salary paid to Emma Sterner was reasonable compensation for her secretarial services.
3. No, because Sam Goldberger failed to establish that he valued the inventory in accordance with the IRS regulations, despite following generally accepted accounting principles.
4. No, because Sam Goldberger did not use any portion of the residence exclusively for business purposes, and the rent payments for 1980 were made by Goldberger, Inc. , not Sam Goldberger.
5. No, because Sam Goldberger did not substantiate the travel and entertainment expenses as required by section 274(d).
6. Yes, because the proceeds from the sale of the cabin were includable in income, as Sam Goldberger did not provide evidence of the cabin's basis or inability to apportion basis.
7. No, because neither Goldberger, Inc. , nor Sam Goldberger were liable for additions to tax under section 6653(a)(1) and (2).

Court's Reasoning

The court found that it had jurisdiction to determine International's DISC status because it was necessary to redetermine Goldberger, Inc. 's deficiency. The court upheld the IRS regulation excluding advances to related parties from qualified export assets, as it was consistent with the DISC legislation's purpose to ensure tax-deferred profits were used for exporting. The advances did not qualify as export property under section 993(c)(1) because they were not used to purchase inventory. The salary deduction for Emma Sterner was upheld as reasonable compensation for her secretarial services. Sam Goldberger's inventory valuation was disallowed because it did not conform to IRS regulations, despite following generally accepted

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

accounting principles. The rent deductions were disallowed because the residence was not used exclusively for business, and the 1980 rent payments were made by Goldberger, Inc. The travel and entertainment expenses were disallowed due to lack of substantiation. The proceeds from the cabin sale were includable in income because Sam Goldberger did not provide evidence of the cabin's basis or inability to apportion basis. Finally, the court found no negligence or intentional disregard in the taxpayers' actions, so they were not liable for additions to tax.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that advances from a DISC to a related party must be used for purchasing export property to qualify as export assets. Taxpayers should carefully document the use of such advances to avoid DISC disqualification. The case also underscores the importance of adhering to IRS regulations for inventory valuation and substantiating travel and entertainment expenses. Practitioners should advise clients to maintain clear records and ensure that home office deductions comply with the exclusive use requirement. The decision also serves as a reminder that proceeds from asset sales must be reported unless a basis can be established or apportionment justified. This ruling has been cited in subsequent cases addressing DISC status and related party transactions, emphasizing the need for strict compliance with DISC rules.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.