

Quarterly Supplement To

Business, Legal, And Tax Planning for the Dental Practice

Second Edition

The purpose of the Quarterly Supplement is to continually update the material contained in **Business, Legal, And Tax Planning for the Dental Practice**, Second Edition, as "free-standing" articles relative to current business, legal, tax and pending legislative matters that affect your practice. These Quarterly Supplements also reflect my ongoing experiences as an attorney representing dental and dental specialty practices. At times, articles will be written by friends who consist of tax attorneys, accountants, actuaries and dentists. The articles contained in the Quarterly Supplements are consistent with the chapters contained in my book, which you may download at no charge at www.WickensLaw.com — click Dental Law.



William P. Prescott, E.M.B.A., J.D.

Author

Practice Transition Attorney

Former Dental Equipment and Supply Representative

Fall, 2010 In This Supplement

**Current Developments In
The Sale Of Personal Goodwill**

© Copyright 2010,
William P. Prescott, E.M.B.A., J.D., and
Wickens, Herzer, Panza, Cook & Batista Co.
All rights reserved.

William P. Prescott, E.M.B.A., J.D.
Wickens, Herzer, Panza, Cook & Batista Co.
35765 Chester Road
Avon, Ohio 44011-1262
Direct: 440.930.8067
Fax: 440.930.8098
WPrescott@WickensLaw.com
www.WickensLaw.com – click Dental Law

This Quarterly Supplement is not intended to provide the reader with specific legal or tax advice. For specific solutions to legal and tax matters, please consult with your legal counsel and CPA.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE

To ensure compliance with the requirements imposed by IRS Circular 230, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding tax-related penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matter(s) addressed herein.

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SALE OF PERSONAL GOODWILL

For those dentists, veterinarians and other professionals ("Professionals") who practice through C-corporations, the sale of the corporation's assets are double taxed;¹ 35% at the corporate level and 15% at the individual level. Since 1998, advisors, relying on the *Martin Ice Cream* and *Norwalk* cases,² in which the taxpayers won and goodwill was deemed personal, have minimized this double tax by taking the position that the Professional's goodwill is personal and not corporate. To the extent that the Professional's goodwill is personal, it is arguably taxed on one level at the favor capital gains rate, currently 15%. Thus, a double tax is avoided on the largest part of the sale, the personal goodwill.

However, in the recent *Howard* case,³ involving Dr. Howard, a dentist who sold the assets of his corporation (the "Corporation") and his goodwill, the court held that the goodwill was corporate and not personal. The ruling resulted in a double tax on the sale of the Corporation's assets. What made the difference in the rulings by the courts? In *Martin Ice Cream* and *Norwalk*, the shareholder-employees did not have covenants not to compete with the corporations employing them. Unfortunately, Dr. Howard did, and the court ruled against him.

The Howard Case

Dr. Howard began practicing in 1972 and incorporated his dental practice as a C-corporation in 1980. At that time, Dr. Howard also entered into a covenant not to compete with the Corporation, which was common at that time, to obtain favorable retirement plan contributions and fringe benefits. The restrictive covenant was in effect during Dr. Howard's employment with the Corporation and for a period of three years thereafter. The restrictive covenant had a radius of 50 miles from Spokane, Washington. In 2002, the Corporation sold its dental practice assets and Dr. Howard attempted to sell his personal goodwill. The purchase price allocation was \$47,100 to the Corporation's tangible assets, \$549,900 to Dr. Howard's personal goodwill, and \$16,000 to Dr. Howard's covenant not to compete with the purchaser. The IRS re-characterized the sale of personal goodwill as a corporate asset, which resulted in a tax deficiency and interest of \$74,921. The court did not accept the purchase price allocation, partly because of the purchasing dentist's testimony that there was no negotiation as to the allocation and who stated that even if the 2002 Asset Purchase Agreement terminated the 1980 covenant not to compete, that would not have changed the characterization of the goodwill generated from 1980 through 2002.

The government argued that the goodwill was owned by the Corporation for three reasons. First, Dr. Howard was a Corporate employee with a covenant not to compete for three

¹ Tax Reform Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-514, 1986-3 C.B. (vol. 1) 1.

² *Martin Ice Cream Co. v. Commissioner.*, 110 T.C. 189, 208 1998 WL 115614 (1998); *Norwalk v. Commissioner*, T.C. Memo 1998-279, 76 TCM 208 (1998).

³ *Howard v. U.S.*, 2010 WL 3061626 (E.D. Wash.), July 30, 2010.

years after he no longer owned stock in the Corporation. Second, the Corporation earned the income and, correspondingly, earned the goodwill. Finally, attributing the goodwill to Dr. Howard was not consistent with the economic reality of Dr. Howard's relationship with the Corporation.

The government relied on three cases for its position that the goodwill was corporate rather than personal. First, in the *Furrer* case,⁴ the court divided an employee's goodwill as goodwill for his company and separately as goodwill for himself, "such as personal contacts". Second, in *Martin Ice Cream*, the court found that the goodwill of a corporation was an individual asset where the employer had not "obtained exclusive rights to either [the employee's] future services or a continuing call on the business generated by [the employee's] personal relationships." Finally, in the *Norwalk* case, the government relied on the proposition that if an employee works for a corporation under contract with a covenant not to compete, as Dr. Howard did, then the corporation and not the individual Professional, owns the goodwill.

The government also contended that the Corporation owned the goodwill generated by Dr. Howard's dental practice because the Corporation was the entity that earned the income. The government relied on the *Johnson* case⁵ and stated that in a professional service corporation that employs a Professional, such as Dr. Howard, a two-part test is used to determine whether the corporation or the employee is considered to be the controller of the income. The first prong is whether the Professional is an employee of the corporation. The second prong is whether the Professional has entered into an employment agreement with the corporation that recognizes its control. The court concluded that the Corporation earned the income and paid the taxes on the income from Dr. Howard's dental practice pursuant to the 1980 employment agreement in effect through 2002 that established the Corporation as Dr. Howard's employer. The court further concluded that, because Dr. Howard was bound by the covenant not to compete for three years after he no longer owns stock in the Corporation, Dr. Howard could not have earned income from a competitive dental practice within the 50 mile restricted radius. The court noted that even if the goodwill had belonged to Dr. Howard personally, it would likely have very little value because the 50 mile radius would discourage patients from following Dr. Howard to a new location.

Lessons To Be Learned

1. Plan for the Sale. The covenant not to compete in the *Howard* case should have been terminated long before the practice sale. This leads to an interesting question. How long prior to the sale of the practice must the covenant be terminated in light of the shareholder's ability to terminate it at any time prior to the sale? The court raised the point that the covenant not to compete was in effect from 1980 through 2002, and during that time, the goodwill was a corporate asset and not personal goodwill. For example, the Professional has a covenant not to compete with the C-corporation for 25 years. It is terminated five years prior to the sale of the

⁴ *Furrer v. Commissioner*, 556 F.2d 1115, 1117-1118 (9th Cir. 1997).

⁵ *Johnson v. Commissioner*, 78 T.C. 882, 891, 1982 WL 11099 (1982); aff'd. w/o op. 734 F.2d 20 (9th Cir. 1984).

practice. The appraised value of the personal goodwill is \$500,000. Under this analysis, the value of the personal goodwill may be reduced by 4/5; \$500,000 to \$100,000.

The Professional's legal counsel should review any and all corporate records to ensure that the goodwill belongs to the individual and not to the corporation. In addition to terminating any covenant not to compete with the corporation, the attorney should be authorized to review the corporation's proceedings of incorporator (which should be contained in the corporation's record book) to ensure that the goodwill was not transferred to the corporation at the time of its formation. Lastly, the *Howard* case stated that Dr. Howard's employment agreement with the Corporation did not address whether the corporation or Dr. Howard owned the goodwill. Thus, it may be very helpful to have Minutes designating that the goodwill is owned by the Professional. Not bulletproof, but perhaps useful.

2. If The Professional Plans To Practice 10 Or More Years, Consider Converting To An S-Corporation. Consider converting the Professional's C-corporation to an S-corporation if the Professional plans on practicing ten or more years. S-corporations that have never been C-corporations and C-corporations that have been converted at least ten year prior to the practice sale avoid the double tax problem. However, the conversions have complexities, particularly relating to avoiding a double tax on accounts receivable.

3. The Professional Should Authorize an Appraisal of The Personal Goodwill Versus Any Corporate Goodwill. The *Howard* case was lost based on the covenant not to compete that Dr. Howard had with the Corporation. Any covenant not to compete with the Corporation must be distinguished from the covenant not to compete entered into with the purchaser of the professional practice. If Dr. Howard would not have had a covenant not to compete with the Corporation, the question probably would have been, "What is the value of the personal goodwill versus any corporate goodwill and why?" Without this specific type of appraisal, which is a separate appraisal from the appraisal of the practice, the Professional loses.

4. Expect Increased Audits on the Sale of Personal Goodwill. The IRS is well aware that Professionals with goodwill are avoiding the double tax by structuring the sale of the practice primarily as the sale of personal and not corporate goodwill. Because Forms 8594 must be filed with the IRS by all sellers (the Professional, the corporation and the purchaser) the IRS can determine whether personal goodwill was sold. The Professional should authorize advisors to plan in advance to defend why the goodwill is personal and not corporate. A very significant factor is if the Professional sells the practice, hypothetically, without a covenant not to compete and establishes another practice near the former location, what percentage of the patients would follow the Professional? Usually, all of them. If under audit, however, the advisory team needs proof and an appraisal of the personal goodwill versus any corporate goodwill is essential. Other factors indicating personal goodwill include efforts to transfer personal goodwill to the purchaser, continued limited employment with the purchaser, an introductory letter to patients (and referral sources if a specialty practice), personal introductions to patients (and any referral sources) and an allocation between payment methods of fee for service versus reduced fee plans.

5. Personal Goodwill in Co-Ownership Buy-Outs. For shareholder buy-outs, sometimes the transaction is structured as the corporation's purchase of the Professional's stock

at a low value excluding goodwill, coupled with corporation's purchase of the Professional's personal goodwill. Under the *Howard*, *Martin Ice Cream* and *Norwalk* cases, the Professional cannot have personal goodwill if the Professional has a covenant not to compete with the professional corporation. However, would not the other shareholder(s) of the corporation's practice require a covenant not to compete from the departing or retiring owner? This point almost effectively eliminates the buy-out of personal goodwill in co-ownership. In co-ownership, this problem is also applicable to S-corporations because the buy-out of the Professional's personal goodwill could either cause the termination of the S-election due to a disproportionate distribution or be considered as the S-corporation's redemption/purchase of the Professional's stock. This would result in a double tax or purchase of the Professional's practice interest in after-tax or non-deductible dollars to the purchaser. Another important deterrent to this method is that if the practice was formed prior to August 10, 1993, the anti-churning rules apply under Internal Revenue Code Section 197(f)(9) and the goodwill is not amortizable.

Conclusion

While the *Howard* case should come as no surprise, it teaches some important lessons. First, terminate any employment agreement that the Professional has with the C-corporation and take steps to ensure that the Professional's goodwill is personal. Second, consider converting to an S-corporation if the Professional plans to practice at least ten years. Third, if the Professional plans to sell the Professional's practice as a C-corporation, obtain an appraisal of the personal goodwill. Fourth, expect increased audits of sales of personal goodwill. Finally, be cautious of the purchase and sale of personal goodwill in co-ownership.