7 T.C. 1103 (1946)

A taxpayer is not entitled to a depletion deduction under sections 23(m) and 114(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code for the processing of waste or low-grade ore from a dump, as the dump is not considered a “mine” or natural mineral deposit.

Summary

Chicago Mines Company (Chicago Co.), a subsidiary of London Extension Mining Company (London Co.), leased a waste ore dump from London Co. and claimed a depletion deduction on its income from processing the dump. London Co. also claimed a depletion deduction on royalty income from Chicago Co., and on income from its own processing of the same dump after Chicago Co. dissolved. The Tax Court held that neither company was entitled to the depletion deduction because the ore dump was not a “mine” or a natural mineral deposit. Furthermore, the court found the companies acted as separate entities in their business dealings.

Facts

London Co. owned a half-interest in several mining claims, including the American Mine. From 1930 to May 1940, Amer Mining Co. leased the claims and extracted ore, creating a waste and low-grade ore dump, mostly on the Fraction claim, adjacent to the American Mine. London Co. indirectly acquired the lease under which Amer Mining Co. had operated and created the dump. In June 1940, London Co. leased the dump to its subsidiary, Chicago Co., which processed the dump until its dissolution in October 1940. London Co. then processed the dump itself. London Co. also conducted underground mining operations on the American Mine.

Procedural History

Chicago Co. deducted percentage depletion on its tax return, which the Commissioner disallowed. London Co. also claimed depletion, which was partially disallowed. The cases were consolidated in the Tax Court, addressing the depletion deductions for both Chicago Co. and London Co.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Chicago Co. is entitled to a depletion deduction for processing the American dump under a lease from its parent company, London Co.?

2. Whether London Co. is entitled to a depletion deduction on royalty income received from Chicago Co. for the processing of the American dump?

3. Whether London Co. is entitled to a depletion deduction on income from its own processing of the American dump?

4. Whether London Co. can include income from the American dump in calculating

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the depletion deduction for its underground mining operations at the American Mine?

Holding

1. No, because the ore dump is not a "mine" or natural mineral deposit, and Chicago Co. did not demonstrate it was operating as one with its parent company, London Co.

2. No, because the dump is not a "mine," and London Co. did not extract the ore from the ground; Amer Mining Co. did.

3. No, because the dump is a separate property from the mine, and the waste material was not extracted as part of London Co.'s integrated mine operation.

4. No, because the dump and the underground mine are separate properties; income from the dump cannot be combined with losses from the underground mine to calculate depletion.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that depletion is a matter of legislative grace, and the taxpayer must demonstrate they are within the statute's parameters to qualify for the allowance. The court determined the American dump did not qualify as a "mine" or natural mineral deposit under sections 23(m) and 114(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The court distinguished this case from *New Idria Quicksilver Mining Co. v. Commissioner*, emphasizing that in *New Idria*, the taxpayer purchased the mine itself after previous owners created the dump. In contrast, here, the dump was created by Amer Mining Co., a lessee, and was considered personal property. The court relied on *Atlas Milling Co. v. Jones*, which held that tailings were not a mine but personal property and that depletion occurs when the minerals are initially severed from the mine.

The court rejected Chicago Co.'s argument that it was merely an *alter ego* of London Co., stating that London Co. treated Chicago Co. as a separate entity by entering into a lease agreement and dividing income between the two companies for tax purposes. The court also found that "the royalty proceeds of processing the waste dump, received from Chicago Co., are not the result of the working of a mine by London Co."

Regarding the underground mining operations, the court emphasized that the waste dump was located primarily on the Fraction claim, separate from the American Mine claim, and that London Co. acquired the right to work the dump via transfer from Amer Co. Therefore, London Co.'s activity on the dump was separate from its mine operation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that the depletion deduction is generally limited to the extraction of minerals from natural deposits and does not extend to the processing of previously extracted waste or low-grade ore found in dumps. This decision emphasizes the importance of establishing that the taxpayer has an economic interest in the natural deposit itself and that the processing activity is an integral part of the mining operation.

Furthermore, the court's refusal to disregard the separate corporate identities of Chicago Co. and London Co. underscores the principle that taxpayers cannot selectively disregard the legal structure of their business to gain tax advantages. When assessing depletion deductions, legal professionals should carefully analyze the source of the processed material, the taxpayer's economic interest in the original deposit, and the degree of integration between the extraction and processing activities. Subsequent cases have cited this decision when considering the eligibility of depletion deductions related to mineral processing activities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.