

# Noncompete Agreement Taxation and Valuation Considerations in Corporate Acquisitions

Robert F. Reilly, CPA

*Corporate acquirers expect certain contractual protections for their investments in merger and acquisition (“M&A”) transactions. Typically, acquirers expect sellers to enter into noncompetition agreements as part of the M&A transaction. This acquirer expectation relates to the sale of a subsidiary target company by a parent corporation, and this acquirer expectation relates to the sale of a private target company by the selling stockholder/employees. There are legal considerations to the transaction counterparties related to the structuring of the noncompete agreement provisions. And, there are taxation considerations for the transaction counterparties related to the valuation of the noncompete agreement provisions. Valuation analysts (“analysts”) who advise in M&A transactions should be aware of both the taxation considerations and the valuation considerations related to noncompete agreements. Analysts can assist the transaction counterparties and their legal counsel by developing noncompete agreement fair market valuations that may be used for both (1) the seller’s transaction sale price allocation and (2) the acquirer’s transaction purchase price allocation.*

## INTRODUCTION

Corporate acquirers typically expect that seller non-compete agreements will be part of the corporate acquisition structure. This transaction structuring statement is true in most business acquisitions. And, this transaction structuring statement is particularly true in the acquisition of a professional services business.

If the seller of the target company is a parent corporation, then the buyer may expect a noncompetition agreement from the corporate seller. In other words, the buyer does not want the seller corporation to compete with the target company during the term of the noncompete agreement.

The buyer may not want to risk its investment in the target company with regard to either:

1. the seller’s development of a competitive start-up venture or

2. the seller’s acquisition of an established business in the target’s industry.

If the target company sellers are individuals (and, particularly, target company employee/shareholders), then the buyer may expect a noncompetition agreement directly with the selling shareholders.

In other words, the buyer may not want the selling employee/shareholders to take the target company sale proceeds and start, acquire, or work for another competing company in the target’s industry.

This discussion focuses on the situation where:

1. the target company is a private corporation and
2. the sellers are employee/shareholders.

This discussion summarizes the taxation and other structuring considerations related to a transaction where employee/shareholders are selling the private C corporation stock to a C corporation acquirer.

Some of the taxation and other structuring considerations discussed herein also apply to the corporate acquirer's purchase of the corporate subsidiary stock of a parent corporation seller. However, the principal focus of this discussion will be taxation and valuation guidance related to the employee/shareholders' sale of a private corporation.

## NONCOMPETE AGREEMENTS

If there is a noncompetition provision in the transaction stock purchase agreement or the transaction asset purchase agreement, then that provision is typically referred to as a noncompete or noncompetition covenant.

If there is a separate contract between the transaction counterparties (outside of the stock purchase agreement or the asset purchase agreement), then that contract is typically referred to as a noncompete or noncompetition agreement.

However the contract provisions are structured, the objectives of the transaction counterparties are the same. The sellers want to sell the target company and receive the sale transaction proceeds.

The acquirer wants to protect its investment in the acquired target company. Accordingly, the sellers agree not to compete in the industry or profession of the target company for a specified period of time.

Noncompete agreements are individually negotiated, and they vary as to the following terms and provisions:

1. The definition of the target industry, industry segment, or profession
2. The definition of competition or noncompetition (versus, for example, nonsolicitation)
3. The term or length of the noncompetition period
4. The geographic area covered by the noncompetition agreement
5. The penalties for intentional or unintentional violations of the noncompetition provisions

Noncompete agreements are considered to be contracts under state law. Each state may have its own interpretation of what noncompete agreement provisions are considered reasonable and enforce-

able under that state's laws. Accordingly, legal counsel for each of the transaction counterparties should carefully draft and review the noncompete agreement terms and provisions.

This discussion is not intended to provide legal advice. Rather, this discussion solely considers the taxation and valuation considerations of the noncompete agreement during the transaction negotiation process.

Typically, the consideration paid by the buyer to the sellers for the noncompete agreement is not part of the transaction purchase price paid for the stock of the C corporation target company.

The noncompete agreement with the sellers is generally considered to be an amortizable intangible asset that is separately acquired by the buyer. The value of that intangible asset is separate from the value of the target company stock that is acquired by the buyer.

The noncompete agreement intangible asset is generally amortizable by the buyer over a 15-year amortization period under Internal Revenue Code Section 197(d). The payments received by the employee/shareholders as consideration for the noncompete agreement are typically considered to be ordinary income (and not capital gain) to the sellers.

Therefore, the allocation of the total transaction consideration between the target company stock and the noncompete agreement is typically an important consideration to both the buyer and the sellers.

This total transaction consideration allocation is often an area of disagreement between the Internal Revenue Service (the "Service") and both sets of transaction counterparties.

## AMORTIZATION OF THE NONCOMPETE AGREEMENT

Under Section 197(d), a noncompete agreement either with a parent corporation seller or with selling shareholders/employees should be amortizable by the acquirer over a 15-year cost recovery period.

However, Section 197(d)(1)(E) indicates that a noncompete agreement is not a Section 197 intangible asset if the agreement is not entered into "in connection with an acquisition (directly or indirectly) of an interest in a trade or business or substantial portions thereof."

Therefore, a noncompete agreement entered into directly by the acquirer with the target company nonshareholder employees should not be considered a Section 197 intangible asset.

Accordingly, such nonselling shareholder noncompete agreements should not be amortized over 15 years. Rather, the acquirer should expect to be able to amortize such a noncompete agreement over the contract term of the agreement.

Typically, such noncompete agreement contract terms are fairly short-term—such as two or three years. Nonetheless, the Service may take the position that all of the transaction-related noncompete agreements should be amortized over 15 years.

Even though the counterparties to the noncompete agreements are not the sellers, the Service may claim that the agreements were entered into as part of the business acquisition.

This Service position will not change the value of the nonseller noncompete agreements. But, it will spread out the acquirer's amortization income tax deductions over a longer time period.

The courts have concluded that seller noncompete agreements should be amortized over the Section 197 15-year period.

The First Circuit affirmed such a Tax Court decision in *Recovery Group, Inc. v. Commissioner*.<sup>1</sup> In *Recovery Group*, the Tax Court ruled that a noncompete agreement related to the redemption of a 23 percent block of S corporation stock was a Section 197 intangible asset. Even though the noncompete agreement had a one-year contractual term, the Tax Court ruled that the cost of the agreement had to be amortized over 15 years.

In *Recovery Group*, the Tax Court (and the Court of Appeals) concluded that any noncompete agreement payment related to the purchase or redemption of stock should be amortized over the Section 197 15-year period—regardless of the contractual term of the noncompete agreement.

## TAX INCENTIVES TO UNDERSTATE THE VALUE OF THE NONCOMPETE AGREEMENT

Some acquirers may have an economic incentive to understate the target company's purchase price allocation to any seller noncompete agreement. This incentive occurs because the noncompete agreement value will be amortized over 15 years.



Many other categories of target company assets may be depreciated over much shorter periods. Acquirers will typically receive cost recovery on the target company's receivables and inventory in the year after the acquisition.

Acquirers are typically able to depreciate the target company's machinery and equipment over periods of less than 15 years.

Such acquirers may have an economic incentive to understate the allocation of the target company purchase price to any seller noncompete agreement. The acquirer will amortize the fair market value allocated to the noncompete agreement intangible asset over a relatively long 15-year period.

For this reason, the Service may challenge the amount of the total transaction consideration that the acquirer allocates to any seller noncompete agreement.

The Service may claim that the allocation was understated—and that the actual fair market value of the agreement is greater than the amount recognized by the acquirer.

The selling shareholders may also have an economic incentive to understate the target company purchase price allocation to the noncompete agreements. Noncompete agreement payments received by the sellers are treated as ordinary income to them.

In contrast, payments received by the sellers for the target company stock (a capital asset) or for the target company real estate, equipment, or goodwill (Section 1231 assets) are treated as capital gains to the sellers.

So, if both the acquirer and the selling shareholders have an economic incentive to understate the purchase price allocation to any noncompete agreements, the Service will likely scrutinize the value assigned to that intangible asset. In particular, the Service may challenge any transaction where little or none of the target company purchase price is allocated to any seller's noncompete agreement.

Depending on how the transaction is structured, the Service realizes that the acquirer may be indifferent as to a purchase price allocation to goodwill or to the noncompete agreement.

To the acquirer, these two categories of assets are both Section 197, 15-year amortization intangible assets. To the selling shareholders amount of the purchase price allocated to the noncompete agreement results in ordinary income—while the goodwill (a capital asset) allocation results in a capital gain.

## TAX INCENTIVES TO OVERSTATE THE VALUE OF THE NONCOMPETE AGREEMENT

Because of the relatively lengthy 15-year amortization period, acquirers may have the above-described incentive to understate the noncompete agreement value in:

1. Section 1060 asset purchase transactions or
2. stock purchase transactions that qualify for the Section 338 election (i.e., that are treated as an asset purchase transaction).

In contrast, in stock purchase transactions that do not qualify for the Section 338 election, the acquirer has an economic incentive to overstate the value of any seller noncompete agreements.

In the typical stock purchase transaction, the acquirer receives a carryover tax basis in the target company assets. That is, the acquirer does not get to depreciate or amortize any purchase price premium paid in excess of the target assets' tax basis.

In such a transaction structure, the acquirer has an incentive to overstate the total consideration allocation to the noncompete agreements.

Instead of a zero cost recovery of the purchase price premium, the acquirer may amortize the purchase price allocated to the Section 197 noncompete agreements over 15 years.

In such a transaction structure, the Service may carefully scrutinize the amount of the purchase price allocated to any seller noncompete agree-

ments. The Service may claim that the amount of the purchase price allocation claimed by the transaction parties is greater than the actual fair market value of the seller noncompete agreements.

## THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NONCOMPETE AGREEMENT

The Service's position may be that, in acquisitive transactions, noncompete agreements only have value when the seller has an actual capacity to compete with the target company.

In assessing the fair market value of the selling shareholder/employee's noncompete agreement, the Service typically considers the seller's capacity to compete based on such factors as age, health, financial ability, technical expertise, industry contracts, regulatory or other restrictions, and geographic proximity.

In addition, in assessing the fair market value of the seller's noncompete agreement, the Service typically looks for one of the following conditions:

1. The target company is a service-based business (or a knowledge-based business)—and not a capital-intensive business.
2. The selling shareholder/employee has identifiable technical expertise (such as proprietary knowledge of process designs, product recipes or formulas, or other trade secrets).
3. The selling shareholder/employee has personal relationships with suppliers, vendors, subcontractors, bankers, or other providers of goods and services to the target company.
4. The selling shareholder/employee has personal relationships with key employees of and/or consultants to the target company.
5. The selling shareholder/employee has personal relationships with customers, clients, patients, distributors, dealers, franchisees, and so forth.
6. The selling shareholder/employee is well known in the industry or profession for having unique experience, expertise, prominence, or eminence.

In assessing the fair market value of the seller's noncompete agreement, the Service typically also considers the legal enforceability of the contract. Such legal enforceability is often an issue of state-specific contract law and employment law statutes and/or judicial precedent.

These state-specific contract law issues may include the following factors:

1. The term of the agreement—depending on the state and the industry or profession, courts generally consider two- to three-year terms to be reasonable.
2. The scope of the agreement—which generally considers the extent of the restrictions on the seller's ability to earn a living.
3. The geographic area covered by the agreement—which generally considers whether the seller's noncompetition territory is local, regional, or national.

## THE DOUBLE TAXATION IN THE SALE OF C CORPORATION SHAREHOLDERS

If the target company is a C corporation and the transaction is structured as an asset sale (or a stock sale followed by a Section 338 election), then the selling shareholders may be subject to double taxation on the gain related to the sale.

First, the target company itself will recognize a taxable gain on the sale of its assets to the acquirer (to the extent that the sale price exceeds the target company's asset tax basis).

Second, the selling shareholders are also subject to taxation when the target company distributes the remaining (after-tax) sale proceeds to the shareholders. That is, the selling shareholders are subject to tax on the gain related to the target company's distribution of the transaction sale proceeds.

For this reason, the selling shareholders in such a transaction may have an economic incentive to overstate the portion of the total transaction consideration allocated to any noncompete agreements. The payments for the noncompete agreements are only taxed once to the selling shareholders.

In addition, the selling shareholders have an economic incentive to overstate the portion of the total transaction consideration allocated to any intangible assets that are personally owned by those selling shareholders.

For example, in a private company sale transaction, the selling shareholders may personally own trade secrets, customer/client relationships, or personal goodwill. The acquirer's payments for these personally owned intangible assets is only taxed once to the selling shareholders.

Whether these intangible assets are target-company-owned or selling-shareholder-owned, they are Section 197 intangible assets to the acquirer.

Regardless of who the seller is, the acquirer will amortize the fair market value of the acquired intangible assets over the Section 197 15-year period.

For example, in the decision in *Norwalk v. Commissioner*,<sup>2</sup> the Tax Court concluded that the goodwill purchased in the business acquisition was the seller's personal goodwill—and not the target company's institutional goodwill. In that case, the acquirer did not obtain noncompete agreements with the selling shareholder/employees.

Based on the specific facts of that case, the Tax Court opined that there was acquired goodwill—in the form of valuable client relationships. However, the valuable goodwill was an intangible asset that was owned personally by the selling shareholder. The goodwill was not an intangible asset that was owned by the target company.

Therefore, that part of the transaction consideration was only subject to one level of taxation—to the selling shareholders (and not to the target company).

The point is that the double taxation related to certain private company sale transactions can be avoided. Such avoidance would occur if the sellers can demonstrate that they personally own—and control—valuable intangible assets. In the typical private company sale transaction, that valuable intangible asset is the sellers' personal goodwill.

Typically, the selling shareholder/employees will have a zero tax basis in the self-created personal goodwill. Therefore, the entire amount of the transaction consideration will be taxable gain to the sellers.

However, the personal goodwill should be a Section 1231 capital asset. Therefore, the amount of the transaction purchase price allocated to the personal goodwill should be only taxed once—at a long-term capital gain tax rate.

Depending on the sellers' level of taxable income, that capital gain tax rate may be 15 percent or 20 percent.

## PURCHASE PRICE ALLOCATION TO PERSONAL INTANGIBLE ASSETS

The Service may likely examine any M&A transaction when a large portion of the transaction consideration is allocated to the seller's personal goodwill.

In most private company purchase price allocations, the Service expects to see a large portion of the transaction consideration to be allocated to the target company's institutional goodwill.

When a material amount of seller personal goodwill is transferred in a target company purchase transaction, the transaction participants should obtain both legal advice and valuation analyst advice.

Legal counsel typically analyze the ownership of the transferred intangible assets. And, legal counsel typically ensure that all of the transaction documents are properly prepared so as to document which parties are transferring which intangible assets.

The valuation analyst typically identifies which intangible assets exist with respect to the business acquisition transfer, and the valuation analyst typically identifies all of the economic attributes related to each transferred intangible asset.

Based on the identification and assessment of these economic attributes, the valuation analyst typically estimates the fair market value of each transferred intangible asset. This intangible asset valuation analysis may be used for both (1) the seller's sale price allocation and (2) the acquirer's purchase price allocation.

As a legal consideration, counsel may document that the seller-owned intangible assets were not previously sold, contributed, or otherwise transferred to the target company. If the sellers are shareholder/employees, then the counsel typically reviews any employment agreements, shareholder agreements, or existing noncompete agreements.

The counsel may consider whether such agreements previously transferred the ownership of any existing or created intangible assets from the employees to the employer target company.

In particular, the counsel often drafts two separate asset and/or stock purchase agreements:

1. One agreement related to the transfer of any personally owned intangible assets
2. One agreement related to the transfer of any corporate-owned intangible assets

If there is only one set of asset purchase or stock purchase transaction documents, then counsel typically ensures that there are separate conceptual provisions related to:

1. the transfer of any personally owned intangible assets and
2. the transfer of any corporate-owned intangible assets.

In the decision in *Martin Ice Cream Company v. Commissioner*,<sup>3</sup> the Tax Court concluded that the customer relationships intangible asset transferred in the business acquisition had been personally owned by the shareholder/employee. The customer relationships intangible asset was not an asset owned or controlled by the target company.

In reaching this conclusion in the *Martin* case, the Tax Court emphasized two issues:

1. The selling shareholder/employee did not have either an employee agreement or an existing noncompete agreement with the target company.
2. The customer relationship intangible asset had never been transferred to the target company.

In the *Martin* decision, the Tax Court concluded that the target company did own other intangible assets that were also transferred in the business acquisition. Specifically, the Tax Court recognized that the target company owned the following intangible assets:

1. Distribution rights
2. Corporate books and records

However, the court did not assign a significant amount of value to these corporate-owned intangible assets.

In the *Martin* case, the sale of the customer relationships intangible asset personally from the selling stockholder to the corporate acquirer avoided the double taxation on that portion of the total transaction proceeds.

In addition, the sale of the personally owned intangible asset to the corporate acquirer was taxed to the selling shareholder at a lower capital gain tax rate.

## CONSULTING AGREEMENTS VERSUS NONCOMPETE AGREEMENTS

As an alternative structure to asking the sellers to enter into noncompete agreements, the acquirer may consider asking the sellers to enter into consulting agreements. This alternative structure is particularly relevant if the selling shareholders will not remain as employees of the target company post transaction.

Obviously, the selling shareholders cannot be employees of—and consultants to—the acquired target company at the same time.

The payments made by the acquirer to the seller consultants are deductible to the buyer over the term of the consulting agreement. In other words, the consulting agreement payments are deductible to the buyer when the payments are made to the seller consultants—and not over a 15-year amortization period (as would be the case with noncompete agreement payments).

Accordingly, the acquirer gets a much faster tax recovery on the fair market value of consulting agreements than on any fair market value assigned in the transaction to noncompete agreements.

To the selling shareholders, both the payments received from a noncompete agreement and the payments received from a consulting agreement are considered to be ordinary income.

The only difference (and the only downside to the sellers) is that the consulting agreement payments are subject to employment taxes. That is, the consulting agreement payments are subject to FICA and other employment taxes.

In many cases, the sellers may already earn wages or self-employment income that would put them above the FICA and other employment tax withholding limitations. In such instances, these sellers would not be subject to such additional employment-related taxes.

However, the consulting payments will likely be subject to the 2.99 percent Medicare Health Insurance portion of self-employment taxes. In addition, the consulting payments may be subject to the additional 0.9 percent Medicare tax on earned income.

However, the acquirer and the sellers may be able to negotiate a compromise with respect to such employment-related taxes. That is, there is a material present value benefit to the acquirer to deduct the consulting payments immediately—compared to deducting the noncompete payments over 15 years.

This present value economic benefit may be large enough to encourage the acquirer to “make whole” the sellers with regard to the additional payroll taxes related to the consulting agreement (versus the noncompete agreement) payments.

Of course, in such consulting agreement arrangements, the sellers should be expected to occasionally consult with the acquirer with respect to the target company. The Service may scrutinize such a consulting agreement arrangement.

If the selling shareholders do not actually “consult,” then the Service may recharacterize the consulting agreement payments as (15-year amortization) noncompete agreement payments.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Corporate acquirers typically expect that the sellers will enter into noncompete agreements with respect to the target company.

This transaction structuring observation is true whether the seller is a parent corporation or an individual selling shareholder. But, this transaction

structuring observation is particularly true when the target company is a private company and the sellers are shareholder/employees.

There are tax considerations to both the acquirer and to the sellers with regard to how the target company sale transaction is structured. In particular, there are tax considerations to both the acquirer and to the sellers with regard to what portion of the total transaction consideration is allocated to any noncompete agreements.

Although much of this discussion applies to all target company acquisitions, this discussion focused on the type of transaction where the target company is a private C corporation and the sellers are shareholder/employees.

In order to maximize the tax benefits to all parties to the M&A transaction, all parties to the business transfer should consult with both legal counsel and valuation analysts.

The legal counsel typically reviews the structure of any noncompete agreements and other transaction agreements. And, the counsel will review the structure of any noncompete agreements and any other transaction agreements.

In addition, the counsel typically reviews the ownership of any seller personally owned intangible assets that are transferred in the target company acquisition.

The valuation analyst typically documents the economic attributes of the noncompete agreements and of any other intangible assets transferred in the target company acquisition. In addition, the analyst typically develops a supportable and credible fair market value valuation of the noncompete agreements and any other intangible assets.

The sellers may rely on such an intangible asset valuation for transaction sale price allocation purposes. And, the acquirer may rely upon such an intangible asset valuation for transaction purchase price allocation purposes.

### Notes:

1. Recovery Group, Inc. v. Commissioner, 652 F.3d 122 (1st Cir. 2011).
2. Norwalk v. Commissioner T.C. Memo. 1998-279 (July 30, 1998).
3. Martin Ice Cream v. Commissioner, 110 T.C. 189 (1998).

*Robert Reilly is a managing director in our Chicago practice office. Robert can be reached at (773) 399-4318 or at [rfreilly@willamette.com](mailto:rfreilly@willamette.com).*

