

Valuation & Litigation Briefing

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2025

In re Marriage of Nelson
**Divergent expert opinions lead
court to value business**

Business sellers need to
look at the big picture

Beware the echo chamber
Court excludes expert testimony
lacking independent analysis

Family businesses:
4 key valuation issues



415 Sargon Way • Suite J • Horsham, PA 19044
Tel: (215) 675-8364 • Fax: (215) 675-3879
www.wm-cpa.com

Knowledgeable • Proactive • Caring • Responsive

In re Marriage of Nelson

Divergent expert opinions lead court to value business

In a contentious divorce proceeding, the Court of Appeals of Iowa in *In re Marriage of Nelson* recently affirmed the trial court's valuation of a business. The parties' experts presented "wildly differing opinions" on the business's value, ranging from between \$251,000 and \$275,000 to \$3.6 million. Neither expert persuaded the trial court, so it performed its own analysis, essentially "splitting the baby."

Background

In 2007, a newlywed couple formed a construction company that eventually became a successful roofing business. It specialized in storm restoration and insurance claim work. The couple allocated 51% ownership to the wife and 49% to the husband to take advantage of the benefits of operating as a female-owned company.

When the company started experiencing collections issues in 2016, the owners began using an "Assignment of Claim and Benefits" form. It required

homeowners to assign their rights and benefits from insurers directly to the roofing company. But in 2020, the Iowa Supreme Court held that the company's use of the assignment forms caused it to effectively act as an unlicensed public adjuster. As a result, the forms were deemed void and unenforceable.

The appellate court upheld the trial court's decision, finding that its valuation was "well within the range of permissible evidence."

The COVID-19 pandemic further impaired the company's performance in early 2020. However, two large storms offset some of the negative impact.

In early 2021, the wife filed a petition for marital dissolution. During the proceedings, the husband offered to buy the wife's 51% interest for \$550,000. She rejected his offer, leaving the parties to settle their differences in court.

Dueling valuations

The wife hired a business valuation professional. Her expert concluded that the business was worth approximately \$276,000 under the income approach and \$251,000 under the asset-based (or cost) approach. The company's biggest asset was more than \$4 million of accounts receivable, including many overdue accounts. Given the accounts' age and doubts about their collectability, the wife's expert ascribed little value to past-due receivables. He also subtracted a 20% discount for lack of marketability (DLOM) when valuing the business.

The husband hired a separate expert who valued the company at \$3.6 million under the asset



Do controlling interests warrant DLOMs?

It's generally accepted in the business valuation community that *noncontrolling* interests in closely held companies are entitled to a discount for lack of marketability (DLOM). The International Glossary of Business Valuation Terms defines marketability as "the ability to quickly convert property to cash at minimal cost." Unlike publicly traded shares, noncontrolling interests in privately held companies lack access to an active market. As a result, the value of a noncontrolling interest is typically adjusted downward to reflect this lack of marketability.

But what about controlling business interests? The application of DLOMs for these interests is somewhat controversial and may vary based on case facts and circumstances. Some valuation experts believe that discounts should apply to controlling interests in privately held companies — even to 100% interests — albeit at lower rates than discounts applied to noncontrolling interests in the same company. They argue that private companies are at a disadvantage relative to public companies when it comes to marketability. Three rationales for this argument are:

1. Unlike publicly traded stock, which usually can be sold quickly, transactions involving private companies can take months to complete.
2. There are significant transaction costs involved with selling a private company.
3. There are significant costs associated with preparing a private company for sale.

Conversely, critics of DLOMs for controlling interests acknowledge that selling a private business involves significant time, effort and cost. However, fair market value is the price at which the universe of hypothetical willing, informed buyers and sellers would consummate the transaction on the valuation date. DLOM critics argue that this standard of value already reflects marketability considerations. So, they believe that applying a DLOM would essentially double-count marketability-related factors.

approach. His expert assumed all the company's receivables were fully collectible and applied no valuation discounts.

Bridging the gap

The trial court found both sides' expert testimony to be unpersuasive and not credible. Both also ignored the significance of the husband's \$550,000 offer to buy out the wife. After reviewing the expert's conclusions, the court valued the business at \$1.5 million based on its own assessment of the accounts receivable. Notably, the court also applied a 20% DLOM to 100% of the business based on evidence presented by the wife's expert. (See "Do controlling interests warrant DLOMs?" above.)

The appellate court upheld the trial court's decision, finding that its valuation was "well within the range of permissible evidence." It also commented that the 20% DLOM was consistent with

lowa precedent that "has affirmed discounting the valuation of a closely held business or its stock in a property division when there is no ready market."

Splitting the baby

The trial court's \$1.5 million valuation translated into an undiscounted value of \$1.875 million, roughly the midpoint between the experts' valuations. When experts arrive at divergent valuations, the parties may be left to the whim of the court, and courts often resort to simply averaging the experts' conclusions.

While this approach might seem fair, it can also be arbitrary or inequitable, depending on the situation — for example, if an expert lacks independence or valuation credentials. To stay in control of a case's outcome in similar situations, consider obtaining a rebuttal report that pinpoints specific sources of the valuation discrepancy for the parties to reconcile *before* going to court. ■

Business sellers need to look at the big picture

It's easy to understand why a selling business owner would assume that the highest offer is the best option. However, selling a company is more complex than simply picking the top dollar. Sellers must consider a range of factors — some of which may end up being more important than price.

More than the bottom line

Many factors affect the ultimate value of a deal for sellers, including:

Financing risk. If a buyer's financing is uncertain, the deal could break down before it crosses the finish line. In such cases, a bidder offering less, but standing on firmer financial ground, may be a better bet.

Deal structure. How a deal is structured also affects risk and the offer's desirability. Most sellers prefer cash over stock deals because they involve less market vulnerability. If the highest bidder

proposes a transaction largely financed with company stock, the seller could be at risk if the share price drops before the deal closes or after the two organizations merge.

Evaluating alternative deal structures is essential to optimize tax outcomes.

Likewise, the deal structure may have tax implications. For example, installment sales may allow sellers to spread their tax obligations over several years rather than paying it all at once. Evaluating alternative deal structures is essential to optimize tax outcomes.

Regulatory concerns. The likelihood that the highest bidder's acquisition will be challenged by government regulators is another valid reason for concern. Going with a lower bid from a company not likely to draw regulatory attention could mean fewer hurdles and greater assurance that the deal will go through.

Organizational compatibility. Continuity and compatibility matter. Business owners need to consider how the company they've built will fare under new ownership. And although ease of integration is primarily a concern for buyers, a difficult merger of operations could affect



the employees' futures. Sometimes, selling to a group of managers at a lower price or transferring the business to a relative may make more sense than selling to outsiders who don't understand or respect the company's culture and values.

Gut feelings. Some deals just don't feel right — regardless of the potential payout. If the seller doesn't see eye-to-eye with the buyer or senses the buyer is being evasive, it might be prudent to step back and consider other offers.

Resolving red flags

None of the previously discussed issues need to be deal-breakers. For example, if a buyer offers a stock deal, the seller might ask for more shares or request a collar to protect against increased risk. If a buyer doesn't appear to have adequate financing, the seller can ask for evidence that it does or make the buyer agree to pay a reverse breakup fee.

Also, sellers can ask prospective buyers to explain why they're interested in the company and what they plan to do with it. For example, does the buyer intend to retain talent or compensate redundant staff? Do the buyer's expected synergies, such as expanded geographic reach or lower combined operating costs, seem realistic? Is successful integration of the two companies likely? The seller should listen carefully to the buyer's answers to assess whether the deal makes sense.

Don't be fooled by the sticker price

Selling a business is a major milestone. While a fair selling price can compensate a business owner for years of hard work and provide for a comfortable retirement, any offer must be carefully evaluated from multiple angles. Experienced financial and legal advisors can help a seller sift through the details and negotiate a deal that achieves a successful and satisfying exit. ■

Beware the echo chamber

Court excludes expert testimony lacking independent analysis

Does an opposing expert appear to be echoing opposing counsel's damages theories, rather than offering an independent, objective analysis? This can be a powerful basis for challenging the expert's credibility or seeking to exclude the expert's testimony altogether. In litigation, the role of a testifying damages expert is to assist the trier of fact in determining a party's financial loss. Experts perceived as *advocates* for one party risk losing credibility or even being precluded from testifying.

Case in point

In *Hutchins & Hutchins, Inc. v. Airboss Defense Group, LLC*, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia granted in part the defendant's

motion in limine to exclude portions of the plaintiff's damages expert testimony. The excluded testimony included a theory that the expert had disavowed in deposition but had been advocated by the plaintiff's counsel.

The case involved an alleged breach of a nondisclosure agreement (NDA) between the plaintiff and the defendant. The defendant was awarded a contract to supply nitrile gloves to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The plaintiff represented several glove manufacturers and offered to help the defendant meet its contractual obligations.

The NDA contained a "noncircumvention provision," prohibiting a party from entering into an



agreement with a business the other party introduced, without written consent. Later, the defendant signed a supply contract with a company that the plaintiff had introduced, without consent. The plaintiff sued the defendant for breach of the NDA, seeking damages in the form of a reasonable finder's fee or resale transaction.

Application of the Lehman Formula

The plaintiff's damages expert offered several damages theories in his report. One theory was the so-called Lehman Formula. The expert described it as a standard method for calculating finder's fees in mergers and acquisitions. He noted that "based on the representations of counsel, it is my understanding that it has been relied upon by courts from other jurisdictions in calculating finder's fees paid to an injured party who brought companies together." Applying the Lehman Formula, the expert opined that a \$227,400 finder's fee would be appropriate in this case.

However, during the expert's deposition, he disavowed his opinion on the use of the Lehman Formula in this case. He admitted that he was unaware of any transaction that used the Lehman Formula in connection with the sale of goods. He also said that he wouldn't have used the formula in this context, except that the plaintiff's counsel had urged him to provide it as an alternative.

Court's analysis

The defendant subsequently moved to exclude the expert's testimony regarding what a reasonable finder's fee would be under the Lehman Formula. The court granted that motion.

In applying the Lehman Formula, the court found the expert didn't conduct his own independent analysis.

In applying the Lehman Formula, the court found the expert didn't conduct his own independent analysis. Instead, he merely repeated counsel's damages theory, which isn't helpful to the trier of fact. The court explained, "When an expert repudiates or disavows an opinion at deposition that was expressed in his expert report, such an opinion should be excluded."

Independence is key

As *Hutchins* illustrates, courts expect experts' opinions to reflect independent, objective analysis, not legal strategy. Courts will likely exclude the testimony of so-called experts who merely parrot counsel's theories. ■

Family businesses: 4 key valuation issues

Families own some of the world's largest and most successful organizations. However, these businesses might not necessarily operate like large public companies. Here are four critical concerns valuation professionals must evaluate when appraising these entities.

1. Family employees

Some business owners hire family members because they're perceived to be more trustworthy. But many feel a sense of obligation or a desire to pass the business on to their offspring, regardless of the qualifications.



When valuing a family-owned entity, an expert needs to objectively assess whether family members are qualified for their positions and whether their compensation is *reasonable*. A hypothetical buyer might be able to consolidate family members' positions and use fewer people to perform their duties for less pay. Conversely, some family businesses overwork or underpay relatives. When adjusting compensation, experts look beyond the person's base pay. They also adjust for payroll taxes, benefits and extraneous perks.

2. Other related-party transactions

Valuators may also inquire about other business transactions with relatives and their businesses. Examples include:

- Rental contracts,
- Supply agreements, and
- Related-party loans.

Transactions that aren't arm's length may require adjustments. For example, suppose the owner of a manufacturing company buys significantly discounted raw materials from a company her brother

owns. When valuing this manufacturer, an expert would consider reducing the company's cash flow to the extent that the related supplier's prices are below market rates.

3. Management style

Family business owners tend to favor gut instinct and trust over formal written policies. Many also favor conservative business strategies and non-financial goals, which can impair growth and profits.

When valuing a controlling interest, an expert considers how much a family business would be worth in the hands of an unrelated hypothetical buyer. In addition, the personal management style that characterizes many family businesses can lead to weak internal controls and increased risks that may affect the company's discount rate.

4. Key person discounts

A family business that relies heavily on one individual may warrant a key person discount. However, these discounts are relatively rare and reserved only for those businesses that would suffer a *significant* monetary loss if the person left the company.

The typical approach to quantifying a key person discount involves estimating the company's monetary loss if the key person were to depart. Another technique is to estimate a percentage discount based on factors such as the individual's skills, the company's financial position, employee turnover and management structure.

A tailored approach

There's no universal way to adjust for family businesses' operational quirks. Experienced valuation professionals recognize common related-party issues and, when necessary, adjust their methodology accordingly. ■



415 Sargon Way • Suite J • Horsham, PA 19044
Tel: (215) 675-8364 • Fax: (215) 675-3879
www.wm-cpa.com

About Wouch, Maloney & Co., LLP

Wouch, Maloney & Co., LLP is a regional certified public accounting firm with offices in Horsham and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and Bonita Springs, Florida. The firm has provided closely held business and individual clients with a wide array of accounting services for over 30 years. Wouch, Maloney & Co.'s domestic, multi-state and international clients reflect a broad range of industries from real estate and construction to manufacturing, wholesale and professional service. The firm offers a comprehensive group of services including tax, audit and accounting, business consulting, estate planning, business valuation, litigation support and forensic accounting.



Our Valuation and Forensic Services:

Our firm has partner and manager level staff who hold certifications as Certified Valuation Analysts (CVA's), Certified in Financial Forensics (CFF's) and Accredited in Business Appraisal Review (ABAR). They have extensive experience in providing valuation services and expert witness testimony in various courts on a wide range of litigation issues including:

- Shareholder/Partner and Business Disputes
- Lost Profits Analysis
- Damage Analyses
- Domestic Relations Matters
- Bankruptcy Services
- Fraudulent Actions
- Criminal Tax Matters
- Valuing Closely Held Businesses
- Purchase or Sale of Business
- Succession Planning
- Estate Planning for Gifts or Inheritances

