

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.PrescottDentalLaw.com.



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

Author

Practice Transition Attorney

Former Dental Equipment and Supply Representative

Fall, 2011 In This Supplement

Your C-corporation — The Goodwill's Still Double Taxed!

© Copyright 2011,
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: 440.695.8067
Fax: 440.695.8098
WPrescott@WickensLaw.com
www.PrescottDentalLaw.com

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.

YOUR C-CORPORATION — THE GOODWILL'S STILL DOUBLE TAXED!

In the October, 2010 Issue, we wrote about the Howard case¹ in which the court held that when Dr. Howard sold the assets of his dental practice, a C-corporation (the Howard Corporation), the goodwill was a corporate asset resulting in a big double tax because Dr. Howard had a covenant not to compete with the Howard Corporation. The Howard case was appealed and argued on July 13, 2011 in Seattle, Washington. Dr. and Mrs. Howard (the Taxpayers) lost the appeal (the Appeal) based upon a Memorandum filed on August 29, 2011.²

For those of you who practice through C-corporations, the sale of your corporation's assets, including goodwill, are double taxed, 35% at the corporate level and 15% at the individual level.³ Since 1998, advisors have attempted to minimize this double tax by taking the position that your goodwill is personal and not a corporate asset by relying on two favorable cases.⁴ Based upon those cases, the goodwill that is characterized as personal is taxed only at one level at favorable capital gains rates and a double tax is avoided on the large part of the sale (roughly 85% plus), the personal goodwill. Unlike the Howard case, the shareholders in the favorable cases, Martin and Norwalk, did not have a covenant not to compete with the corporation employing them.

Appeal

Court's Acknowledgement that Patient Relationships May Be Personal.

The Taxpayers maintained that Dr. Howard's goodwill proceeds were personal assets of Dr. Howard, subject to capital gains treatment at one tax level. The court in the Appeal (the Court) noted that while Dr. Howard's patient relationships may be personal, Dr. Howard had transferred the economic value of the relationships to the Howard Corporation under his covenant not to compete with it.

No Corporate Goodwill Where No Covenant Not To Compete With Your Corporation.

The Court noted that under Norwalk, there is no corporate goodwill where "the business of the corporation is dependent upon its key employees, unless they enter into a covenant not to compete with the corporation or other agreement whereby the personal relationships with clients become property of the corporation..." The Court further noted that under Martin, "personal relationships...are not corporate assets when the employer has no employment agreement [or

¹ *Howard v. U.S.*, 2010 WL 3061626 (E.D. Wash.), July 30, 2010.

² United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, No. 10-35768, D.C. 2:08-cv-00365-RMP.

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

⁴ *Martin Ice Cream Co. v. Commissioner*, 110 T.C. 189, 208 1998 WL 115614 (1998) (Martin); *Norwalk v. Commissioner*, T.C. Memo 1998-279, 76 TCM 208 (1998) (Norwalk).

covenant not to compete] with the corporation..." Does this mean no allocation whatsoever to corporate goodwill which is double taxed? Advisors often recommend some allocation to corporate goodwill because your corporation is custodian of the patient records, employs the staff, etc. For those advisors who recommend no allocation to corporate and all to personal goodwill, this language is helpful. The argument from these advisors is that if there is any allocation to corporate goodwill whatsoever, the Internal Revenue Service (the IRS) can make an argument that the allocation is insufficient, thereby imposing an additional double tax on the corporate goodwill.

No Covenant Not To Compete Between Your Corporation and the Purchaser.

The Court noted that the purchase and sale agreements (the Agreements) in the Howard case provided that both Dr. Howard and the Howard Corporation agreed not to compete with the purchaser (the Purchaser). This point was part of the Court's analysis that the goodwill belonged to the Howard Corporation. The covenant not to compete with the Purchaser should have only been between Dr. Howard and the Purchaser.

No Independent Contractor Agreement for Post-Sale Services Between Your Corporation and the Purchaser.

The Purchaser and the Howard Corporation entered into an independent contractor agreement wherein Dr. Howard, through the Howard Corporation, would continue to render dental services to the Purchaser's patients for three years following the sale. The fact that the Howard Corporation entered into an independent contractor agreement with the Purchaser was also part of the Court's analysis that the goodwill belonged to the Howard Corporation. Dr. Howard should have worked for the Purchaser personally.

Terminating Your Covenant Not To Compete.

The Court implied that even if the Agreements had terminated Dr. Howard's covenant not to compete with the Howard Corporation, the release would have constituted a dividend payment (and double tax), equal to the value of the goodwill. This implication should be distinguished from the outcome in Norwalk, where the covenants not to compete for the shareholders in effect from October 1, 1985 through September 30, 1990 had expired prior to the date of asset distribution on June 30, 1992. In Norwalk, there was no reference to any dividend or double tax for the five years the covenants were in effect. In following Norwalk, any covenant not to compete with your C-corporation should be terminated, the earlier the better.

Further Lessons To Be Learned

1. Court's Acknowledgement That Patient Relationships May Be Personal. It is no longer only a question of whether the patients or referral relationships are personal to you, it is also a question of who owns the goodwill. Your advisors should take this into account when completing the valuation that allocates the goodwill between personal and corporate.

2. No Corporate Goodwill Where No Covenant Not To Compete With Your Corporation. Based upon the Court's analysis of Norwalk and Martin, there is an argument that all goodwill is personal. Your advisors should also consider the Court's analysis of these cases when completing the valuation that allocates the goodwill between personal and corporate.

3. No Covenant Not To Compete Between Your Corporation and the Purchaser. The selling shareholder should be subject to the covenant not to compete with the purchaser's practice entity, not the selling shareholder's C-corporation.

4. No Independent Contractor Agreement Between Your Corporation and the Purchaser. Rendering post-sale services on behalf of the purchaser through your C-corporation as an independent contractor makes it appear to the IRS that your C-corporation owns the goodwill and not you personally. While these arrangements are common, the IRS also does not believe that you are an independent contractor when rendering services for the purchaser, irrespective of whether it's through your corporation.

5. Terminating Your Covenant Not To Compete. Not that many C-corporation shareholders have a covenant not to compete with their own corporation. However, a buy-out of personal goodwill is a common business and tax structure in co-ownership. In co-ownership, it is very common for the shareholders to have covenants not to compete with their corporations. This can be a problem for both C and S-corporations resulting in a double tax. See our October, 2010 article. Best to review these business and tax structures with your advisors sooner rather than later. Then amend the buy-out agreements as appropriate.

The possible double tax involving personal goodwill on the largest part of your practice sale is a reality, but one that can be planned for.