Louise K. Sigman v. Commissioner, 1947 Tax Ct. Memo LEXIS 63 (1947)

When a building is demolished to secure a lease and the land is leased for a parking lot, the undepreciated cost of the building, along with expenses incurred to obtain the lease, can be amortized ratably over the term of the lease, even if there was a time gap between demolition and the final lease agreement.

Summary

Louise K. Sigman demolished a building to lease the land for a parking lot. Although there was a delay between the demolition and the final lease agreement due to permit issues, the Tax Court held that Sigman could amortize the undepreciated cost of the demolished building and the expenses of obtaining the lease over the five-year term of the lease. 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. This case illustrates that the intent and continuity of purpose are key factors in determining whether demolition costs can be amortized over a lease term, even if a lease is not immediately secured.

Facts

Louise K. Sigman owned property with a building on it. She considered several uses for the property and decided that leasing the land for a parking lot would be the most profitable. Sigman received offers to lease the lots for this purpose. She started demolishing the building and received an offer to lease, contingent upon obtaining a permit to cut curbs for parking lot access. An initial lease agreement expired due to permit delays, but eventually, a lease was executed with Louis K. Sigman.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed a deduction claimed by Louise K. Sigman for the undepreciated cost of the demolished building and expenses related to obtaining the lease. Sigman petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court reviewed the case to determine whether the costs could be amortized over the term of the lease.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the undepreciated cost of a building demolished to secure a lease can be amortized over the lease term when there is a time gap between demolition and the final lease agreement.
2. Whether specific expenses, beyond legal fees for the final lease, can be considered costs of obtaining the lease and thus amortizable.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the demolition was directly related to securing the lease for a parking lot, and the taxpayer consistently intended to lease the land for that purpose.
2. Yes, certain expenses beyond the final legal fees (such as wrecking the building and permit fees) are amortizable as costs of obtaining the lease. However, expenses related to unsuccessful lease attempts or improvements not directly required by the final lease are not amortizable.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the demolition of the building was an integral step in preparing the land for its intended use as a parking lot under the lease. Even though a lease was not in effect at the moment the demolition was complete, the intent to lease for parking purposes never wavered. The court emphasized that "there was a purpose, from which there was no deviation, and a lease was entered into promptly when the land was available for use as a parking lot." The court distinguished this case from cases where the building was not destroyed pursuant to a plan for further use of the property. Regarding the expenses, the court allowed amortization of costs directly tied to securing the final lease, such as demolition costs and permit fees. It disallowed costs associated with unsuccessful lease attempts or costs that were not directly required by the terms of the final lease. The court looked at the origin of the expenses and their direct connection to the eventual lease agreement.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on the tax treatment of demolition costs when a taxpayer intends to lease the land. It shows that the key factors are the taxpayer's intent, the direct relationship between the demolition and securing a lease, and the continuity of purpose. Even if there is a time gap between the demolition and the lease agreement, amortization may be permitted if the taxpayer's intent remains consistent. Practitioners should advise clients to document their intent and the business purpose for demolishing buildings when planning to lease the land. It also clarifies that only expenses directly related to securing the final lease agreement can be amortized, requiring careful tracking and documentation of these costs. Later cases applying this ruling would likely focus on demonstrating a clear, unbroken chain of intent to lease the property for a specific purpose following demolition.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.