Rocky Mountain Associates International, Inc. v. Commissioner, 90 T. C. 1231 (1988)

A backdated promissory note does not constitute payment within the required 60-day period for a Domestic International Sales Corporation (DISC) to qualify its assets as qualified export assets.

Summary

Rocky Mountain Associates Export, Inc. (Export), a wholly owned subsidiary of Rocky Mountain Associates International, Inc. (RMAI), sought to qualify as a DISC to defer taxes on export-related income. Export's income was based on commissions from RMAI, which were to be paid within 60 days after Export's fiscal year end. RMAI attempted to pay with a backdated promissory note, but the court ruled that the note did not constitute payment within the required timeframe. Consequently, Export failed to meet the qualified export assets test, disqualifying it as a DISC. The decision had significant tax implications for both Export and RMAI, disallowing Export's income and RMAI's corresponding deduction for the commissions.

Facts

Export, a Colorado corporation, was established as a DISC and was the wholly owned subsidiary of RMAI, which manufactured orthodontic supplies. Export and RMAI entered into an agreement where Export would earn commissions from RMAI's export sales, payable within 60 days after Export's fiscal year end on October 31. For the fiscal year ending October 31, 1980, Export earned $308,443 in commissions but was not paid within the required period. Instead, RMAI delivered a promissory note backdated to November 15, 1980, in July 1981, designating it as a "producer's loan" rather than a commission payment.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the federal income taxes of both Export and RMAI. The case was brought before the United States Tax Court, which reviewed the eligibility of Export as a DISC and the tax consequences for both parties based on the payment method used.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Rocky Mountain Associates Export, Inc. qualified as a DISC for the taxable year ended October 31, 1980.
2. If Export failed to qualify as a DISC, whether there was a deficiency in Export's income tax or a deficiency in RMAI's income tax.
3. If Export qualified as a DISC, whether Export and RMAI reported incorrect amounts of commission income, deemed dividends, and commission expenses for the years in issue.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the backdated promissory note did not constitute payment within 60 days after the close of Export's taxable year, failing to meet the qualified export assets requirement.
2. No, Export had no taxable income for the year in question due to the non-payment of commissions, and RMAI was not entitled to a deduction for the commissions.
3. Not applicable, as Export did not qualify as a DISC.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the Internal Revenue Code sections and regulations governing DISCs, specifically focusing on the requirement that commissions from a related supplier must be paid within 60 days after the close of the DISC's taxable year to be considered qualified export assets. The court determined that the backdated promissory note, delivered after the 60-day period and designated as a producer's loan, did not meet the criteria for a valid payment under the regulations. The court emphasized that the note's backdating did not change the fact that it was not a timely payment. The court rejected arguments that the note could be recharacterized as a commission receivable, as it did not meet the regulatory requirements for such an asset. The court's decision was supported by a majority, with dissenting opinions focusing on different interpretations of tax accounting principles for accrual basis taxpayers.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that backdated promissory notes do not satisfy the payment requirement for DISC qualification, impacting how companies structure their payment methods for commissions to maintain DISC status. It emphasizes the need for strict adherence to the 60-day payment rule, affecting legal and tax planning for companies using DISCs for tax deferral on export income. The ruling also influences how related parties document and execute financial transactions to ensure compliance with tax regulations. Subsequent cases have referenced this decision to uphold the validity of the regulations and the importance of timely and properly designated payments for DISC eligibility.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.