Blumenfeld Enterprises, Inc. v. Commissioner, 23 T.C. 66 (1954)

When a building is demolished to secure a lease under which the lessee erects a new building, the depreciated cost of the old building is recoverable ratably over the term of the lease, even if the lease is not finalized until after the demolition is complete, provided there was a clear intent to lease the land.

Summary

Blumenfeld Enterprises demolished a building on its property with the intention of leasing the land as a parking lot. Although a lease wasn't immediately in place, negotiations were underway, and a lease was eventually secured. The Tax Court held that the unrecovered cost of the demolished building could be amortized over the term of the lease, despite the time gap between demolition and lease execution. The court reasoned that the demolition was directly linked to securing the lease and the taxpayer consistently intended to lease the land for a parking lot.

Facts

The petitioner, Blumenfeld Enterprises, considered various uses for a property it owned, ultimately deciding to lease the land for parking lot purposes. Offers to lease the lots for parking had been received, indicating a ready market. Demolition of the existing building began before a lease was finalized to encourage competitive offers from prospective lessees.
While demolition was underway, an offer to lease was accepted, contingent upon obtaining a city permit to cut curbs for passageways. This agreement expired when the permit wasn't immediately granted. However, efforts to secure the permit continued, and a lease was executed seven months later following the permit's issuance. The adjusted basis of the demolished building was $41,591.67.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the petitioner's deduction for the loss incurred from the demolition of the building. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination, focusing on whether the cost of the demolished building could be amortized over the lease term.

Issue(s)

Whether the unrecovered cost of a building demolished to secure a lease for the land can be amortized over the term of the lease, even if the lease is not executed until after the demolition is completed.

Holding

Yes, because the demolition was undertaken with the clear intention of securing a lease, and a lease was ultimately secured as a direct result of the demolition and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

ongoing efforts to obtain necessary permits. The court found that the delay between demolition and lease execution was immaterial given the continuous intent to lease the land for a parking lot.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on the principle that when a building is demolished to obtain a lease, with the lessee constructing a new building, the depreciated cost of the old building is amortizable over the lease term. The Commissioner argued that no substituting asset (the lease) existed at the time of demolition. However, the court emphasized the continuous plan to lease the land and the eventual execution of a lease as a direct result of that plan.

The court distinguished this case from situations where demolition wasn't part of a plan for future use. Here, there was a consistent purpose, and a lease was promptly entered into once the land was ready for use. The court stated, "Under the peculiar facts present here, we do not think it is material that a lease was not in effect when the building was torn down."

The court also addressed the costs of obtaining the lease, including fees for permits and legal services, holding that these costs, along with the building's adjusted basis, are deductible ratably over the lease term.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that the timing of lease execution is not the sole determining factor in whether demolition costs can be amortized. What matters is the taxpayer's intent and whether the demolition was a necessary step in securing the lease. Attorneys should advise clients to document their intent to lease the property prior to demolition. This case emphasizes the importance of demonstrating a clear and consistent plan for the future use of the land.

Subsequent cases will likely focus on the strength of the evidence demonstrating the taxpayer's intent and the direct link between the demolition and the eventual lease. This ruling benefits taxpayers who demolish buildings with a clear leasing strategy, even if unforeseen delays occur in finalizing the lease agreement. This case helps define the scope of what constitutes a cost of obtaining a lease, allowing taxpayers to deduct these expenses over the life of the lease, improving cash flow and reducing tax liability.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.