Rothstein v. Commissioner, 90 T. C. 488 (1988)

Payments received under an employment contract for a share of proceeds from an asset sale are taxed as ordinary income, not as capital gains, if they do not confer an equity interest.

Summary

In Rothstein v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that payments received by executives under employment contracts, which entitled them to a percentage of the proceeds from the sale of their employer's assets, were taxable as ordinary income rather than capital gains. The court determined that these payments were compensation for services, not proceeds from the sale of a capital asset, as the executives had no equity interest in the company. The decision hinged on the nature of the employment agreement, which lacked provisions for equity ownership, and was supported by precedent that similar arrangements are considered deferred compensation. This ruling impacts how employment contracts are drafted and interpreted for tax purposes, emphasizing the need for clear delineation of compensation versus equity.

Facts

Robert Rothstein and Eugene Cole were employed by Royal Paper Corp. In 1973, they entered into employment agreements with Royal, which were renewed automatically every three years. These agreements entitled them to a base salary, profit sharing, and 12. 5% of the proceeds from the sale of Royal's assets if the sale price exceeded $825,000. No stock certificates or equity interests were issued to them. In 1981, Royal sold its assets, and Rothstein and Cole each received $627,866 as per the employment agreements. They claimed this as capital gains, but the IRS treated it as ordinary income.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency to Rothstein and Cole, treating the payments as ordinary income. The taxpayers petitioned the Tax Court, which consolidated their cases. The court heard arguments and reviewed the employment agreements, ultimately deciding in favor of the IRS's position.

Issue(s)

1. Whether payments received by Rothstein and Cole under their employment agreements with Royal Paper Corp. are taxable as ordinary income or as capital gains.
2. Whether Eugene and Lois Cole are liable for additions to tax under section 6661(a) for the years 1982 and 1983.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. | 1

1. No, because the payments were compensation for services under the employment agreements, which did not confer an equity interest in Royal, thus the payments are taxable as ordinary income.
2. Yes, because the Coles did not contest the additions to tax under section 6661(a), and they conceded liability for additions under sections 6653(a)(1) and 6653(a)(2) at trial.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court analyzed the employment agreements and found that they created only an employer-employee relationship, not an equity interest in Royal. The court relied on *Freese v. United States*, where a similar arrangement was deemed deferred compensation. The agreements contained no provisions for issuing stock certificates or granting equity rights, and the taxpayers had no liability for decreases in Royal's value. The court noted that employment contracts are not capital assets, and payments under them are ordinary income. The court dismissed the taxpayers' argument that the agreements intended to create an equity-like interest, citing a lack of evidence and legal support. The court emphasized that the form of the transaction as an employment contract prevailed over any alleged substance of equity interest.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that payments under employment contracts, even those tied to asset sales, are taxable as ordinary income unless they explicitly confer an equity interest. Legal practitioners must carefully draft employment agreements to distinguish between compensation and equity arrangements. Businesses should consider the tax implications of such agreements and ensure clarity in defining compensation structures. The ruling reinforces the IRS's stance on similar cases and may influence future tax planning strategies for executives. Subsequent cases have upheld this principle, emphasizing the importance of clear contractual language in determining tax treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.