Pagel, Inc. v. Commissioner, 91 T.C. 206 (1988)

Stock warrants received as compensation for services, which do not have a readily ascertainable fair market value at grant, are taxed as ordinary income when sold in an arm's-length transaction, with the amount of income being the fair market value at the time of the sale.

Summary

Pagel, Inc., a brokerage firm, received a warrant to purchase stock in Immuno Nuclear Corp. as compensation for underwriting services. The warrant was not actively traded and had restrictions on transferability. Pagel sold the warrant to its sole shareholder and reported a capital gain. The IRS recharacterized the gain as ordinary income. The Tax Court held that because the warrant did not have a readily ascertainable fair market value when granted, and was received for services, its sale resulted in ordinary income under Section 83 of the Internal Revenue Code. The court upheld the validity and retroactive application of Treasury Regulation §1.83-7.

Facts

Petitioner, Pagel, Inc., a brokerage firm, acted as underwriter for a stock offering by Immuno Nuclear Corp. (Immuno) in 1977.

As compensation for underwriting services, Pagel received a cash commission and a warrant to purchase 23,500 shares of Immuno stock for $10.

The warrant was not transferable for 13 months after the grant and was not actively traded on an established market.

In October 1981, after the transfer restriction lapsed, Pagel sold the warrant to its sole shareholder, Mr. Pagel, for $314,900.

Pagel reported the sale as a capital gain on its corporate income tax return.

The IRS determined that the gain should be treated as ordinary income, arguing it was compensation for services.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency recharacterizing the gain as ordinary income.

Pagel, Inc. petitioned the Tax Court challenging the deficiency.

The Tax Court tried the case, considering whether the income from the warrant sale was capital gain or ordinary income.

Issue(s)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Whether the gain from the sale of the Immuno stock warrant is taxable as ordinary income or capital gain?

2. Whether Section 83 of the Internal Revenue Code and Treasury Regulation §1.83-7 are applicable to the stock warrant received by Pagel, Inc.?

3. Whether Treasury Regulation §1.83-7 is a valid and retroactive application of Section 83?

Holding

1. Yes. The gain from the sale of the warrant is taxable as ordinary income because the warrant was received as compensation for services and did not have a readily ascertainable fair market value at the time of grant.

2. Yes. Section 83 and Treasury Regulation §1.83-7 are applicable because the warrant was transferred in connection with the performance of services.

3. Yes. Treasury Regulation §1.83-7 is a valid and retroactive application of Section 83, as it is consistent with the statute and its legislative history.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 83(a) of the Internal Revenue Code governs the transfer of property in connection with the performance of services. Treasury Regulation §1.83-7 specifies the tax treatment of nonqualified stock options. The court determined the warrant was received in connection with underwriting services, satisfying the “in connection with the performance of services” requirement of Section 83.

The court found that the warrant did not have a readily ascertainable fair market value at the time of grant because it was not actively traded on an established market and was subject to transfer restrictions for 13 months. Therefore, under Treasury Regulation §1.83-7(a), the income recognition is deferred until the warrant’s disposition.

The sale to Mr. Pagel was considered an arm’s-length transaction at fair market value, triggering income recognition at the time of sale. The amount of ordinary income is the fair market value of the warrant at the time of sale ($314,900), less the amount paid for it ($10).

The court rejected Pagel’s argument that Section 83 was not properly before the court, finding that the notice of deficiency provided fair warning of the IRS’s position.

The court upheld the retroactive application of Treasury Regulation §1.83-7, noting that regulations are generally presumed retroactive and that the regulation’s

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

effective date aligns with the effective date of Section 83 itself.

Finally, the court upheld the validity of Treasury Regulation §1.83-7, finding it a reasonable interpretation of Section 83 and consistent with long-standing regulatory and judicial precedent. The court emphasized that the regulation promotes reasonable accuracy in valuing non-publicly traded options, preventing speculative valuations.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the tax treatment of stock warrants and options granted for services, particularly in underwriting and similar contexts. It reinforces that if such warrants do not have a readily ascertainable fair market value at grant (typically due to lack of public trading and transfer restrictions), the service provider will recognize ordinary income upon a later taxable disposition, such as a sale.

Legal practitioners should advise clients receiving warrants or options for services that these instruments are likely to generate ordinary income, not capital gain, when disposed of, unless they meet stringent criteria for having a readily ascertainable fair market value at grant. This case highlights the importance of Treasury Regulation §1.83-7 in determining the timing and character of income from compensatory stock options and warrants. It also underscores that the IRS can raise and apply Section 83 even if not explicitly mentioned in initial deficiency notices, as long as the taxpayer is given fair warning and is not prejudiced.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.