Boston & Providence R.R. Corp. v. Commissioner, 23 B.T.A. 1136 (1940)

A lessor cannot claim a deductible loss for abandoned railroad property during the lease term if the lessee remains obligated to return equivalent property at the lease's end.

Summary

Boston & Providence R.R. Corp. sought a loss deduction for the abandonment of a portion of its railroad line during a lease. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction. The Board of Tax Appeals upheld the Commissioner's decision, reasoning that the lessor did not sustain a loss because the lessee's obligation to return the property in its original condition at the end of the lease remained in effect. The court distinguished cases where the lessor's rights were permanently and definitively determined by a sale of the property, which was not the case here.

Facts

Boston & Providence R.R. Corp. (petitioner) leased its railroad property to another company. During the lease term, a 1.97-mile section of the railroad was abandoned in 1940. The lease agreement required the lessor to participate in actions enabling the lessee's use and management of the property and protected the lessor from loss related to these actions. The petitioner claimed a loss deduction on its taxes for the abandonment of this section.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the petitioner's claimed loss deduction. The Boston & Providence R.R. Corp. appealed the Commissioner's decision to the Board of Tax Appeals.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the abandonment of a portion of the railroad line during the lease term constituted a deductible loss for the lessor.

Holding

1. No, because the lessee remained obligated to return the railroad property in the same good order and condition as at the date of the lease, the petitioner did not sustain a deductible loss in the taxable year.

Court's Reasoning

The Board of Tax Appeals reasoned that the lease agreement protected the lessor from any loss due to actions taken to benefit the lessee's use of the property. The court distinguished this case from *Terre Haute Electric Co. v. Commissioner*, 96

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

F.2d 383, where the abandonment of entire railway lines relieved the lessee of all obligations. Here, the obligation to return the property in its original condition remained. The Board stated, “In our opinion, by so joining in abandonment proceedings, under such circumstances, the petitioner did not deprive itself of its rights at the end of the long term lease to receive the property in the same good order and condition as at the date of the lease.”

The Board also distinguished *Commissioner v. Providence, Warren & Bristol R. Co.*, 74 F.2d 714, and *Mississippi River & Bonne Terre Railway*, 39 B.T.A. 995, because in those cases, the lessor’s rights were definitively determined by a sale of the property. Here, the lease continued, and the lessor’s rights were not permanently altered. The Board concluded that no change occurred in the petitioner’s profit or loss position until the end of the lease, when it could be determined whether the abandonment affected the property’s condition.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that a lessor cannot claim a loss deduction for property abandoned during a lease if the lessee’s obligation to return equivalent property remains. The decision highlights the importance of examining the specific terms of a lease to determine whether abandonment truly constitutes a loss for the lessor. It illustrates that temporary changes to property during a lease do not necessarily trigger a deductible loss if the lessor’s overall rights are protected by the lease terms. Later cases would likely distinguish this ruling if the lease terms explicitly absolved the lessee of the duty to restore or provide equivalent property upon abandonment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.