1 T.C. 222 (1942)

An oil and gas royalty becomes worthless and deductible as a loss when drilling demonstrates the improbability of oil or gas production in commercial quantities, and the royalty loses its sale value.

Summary

Harvey Heller, an investor in oil and gas royalties, claimed loss deductions for royalties he deemed worthless after dry holes were drilled near the royalty sites. The IRS disallowed these deductions, arguing the royalties weren't proven absolutely worthless until all possible producing horizons and sedimentary beds were tested. The Tax Court, however, sided with Heller, holding that a practical test should be applied, and the royalties were indeed worthless in the years claimed because drilling had demonstrated the unlikelihood of commercial production, causing them to lose market value. This decision emphasizes a facts-and-circumstances approach to determining worthlessness.

Facts

Harvey Heller was in the business of acquiring nonproducing oil and gas royalties for investment. He tracked drilling activity, buying royalties where operators were exploring. When a dry hole was drilled on or near his royalty interests down to the lowest known producing formation, Heller deemed the royalty worthless and wrote it off on his books and tax returns. The royalty interests were fractional interests in oil lands located in Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Kansas, and Arkansas.

Procedural History

Heller claimed loss deductions on his 1937, 1938, and 1939 tax returns for oil and gas royalties deemed worthless. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed these deductions, arguing Heller hadn't proven the royalties were condemned or that he relinquished title. Heller then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies assessed by the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether oil and gas royalties become worthless, giving rise to a deductible loss under Section 23(e) of the Revenue Acts of 1936 and 1938, when test drillings demonstrate the probability of finding oil and gas in commercial quantities is too remote to justify further operations, and the royalty interest has no sale value.

Holding

Yes, because an oil and gas royalty becomes worthless when drilling demonstrates the improbability of oil or gas production in commercial quantities, and the royalty loses its sale value among experienced royalty investors.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court relied on a practical test to determine worthlessness, similar to other types of property. The court emphasized the importance of proven facts in each case. The court found that dry holes were drilled on or near Heller’s properties, down to the established productive level, demonstrating to experienced oil men that the royalties would likely never be productive in commercial quantities. The court distinguished the Commissioner’s argument that absolute certainty of worthlessness required testing all possible producing horizons, stating that the statute allowing deductions (section 23) did not permit such a restricted test for oil and gas royalties. The court stated, “As we said in , we think that the worthlessness of an oil and gas royalty, like any other property, is a question of fact which must be determined upon all of the evidence. The statute under which deductions are allowed (section 23) does not permit of any restricted test for this particular type of property.” The court found that the evidence supported Heller’s contentions, except for one royalty interest which Heller conceded became worthless in a prior year.

Practical Implications

This case provides a practical framework for determining when oil and gas royalties can be deemed worthless for tax deduction purposes. It clarifies that absolute certainty (requiring exhaustive testing of all geological possibilities) is not required. Instead, a showing that drilling activity has demonstrated the improbability of commercial production, leading to a loss of market value, is sufficient. This ruling impacts how investors in oil and gas royalties manage their tax liabilities. Later cases would likely cite *Heller* to support a facts-and-circumstances analysis when determining the worthlessness of oil and gas interests. It emphasizes the importance of contemporaneous evidence, such as drilling reports and expert opinions, to support a claim of worthlessness.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.