8 T.C. 173 (1947)

A voluntary conveyance of property to taxing authorities due to unpaid taxes, where the owner has no personal liability and receives no consideration, constitutes an abandonment, resulting in an ordinary loss deductible in full rather than a capital loss subject to limitations.

Summary

William H. Jamison sought to deduct losses from abandoning real estate and selling a rental dwelling, and also contested the allocation of office expenses. The Tax Court held that conveying properties to municipalities due to unpaid taxes without personal liability constituted abandonment, resulting in fully deductible ordinary losses, not capital losses subject to limitations. The court also found that a dwelling used for rental purposes was not a capital asset, making its sale loss fully deductible. Additionally, the court upheld the allocation of office expenses between taxable and non-taxable income proportionally, as the taxpayer failed to prove a more reasonable allocation. The court determined that losses from abandonment are fully deductible, differentiating them from losses from sales or exchanges.

Facts

Jamison, a real estate investor, owned multiple rental properties and securities. He purchased several lots in Brigantine, NJ, and Morehead City, NC, before 1930, hoping to resell them. These lots never developed as anticipated. Facing unpaid property taxes and declining value, Jamison offered to convey the lots to the respective municipalities. He executed deeds transferring the Brigantine lots to the city in 1942 and the Morehead City lots to the county in 1943. The deeds recited nominal consideration that was not actually paid. Jamison also sold a rental dwelling in Dormont, PA, in 1943, incurring a loss. He maintained an office in Pittsburgh, incurring expenses he sought to deduct.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed deductions claimed by Jamison for losses on the abandonment and sale of real estate, as well as a portion of his office expenses. Jamison petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the Commissioner’s determination. The Tax Court reviewed the facts and applicable law to determine the proper tax treatment of the losses and expenses.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the conveyance of real estate to taxing authorities due to unpaid taxes, without personal liability and without receiving consideration, constitutes an abandonment resulting in an ordinary loss, or a sale or exchange resulting in a capital loss subject to limitations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether a dwelling used in the taxpayer's business of renting properties is a capital asset, and whether the loss from its sale is a capital loss subject to limitations.

3. Whether office expenses can be allocated proportionally between taxable and nontaxable income when there is no specific evidence for a more reasonable allocation.

Holding

1. No, because the conveyances were voluntary, without consideration, and represented an abandonment of worthless property where Jamison had no personal liability for the unpaid taxes.

2. No, because the dwelling was used in Jamison's rental business and was subject to depreciation, thus not falling under the definition of a capital asset; therefore, the loss is fully deductible.

3. Yes, because in the absence of adequate evidence to base a more reasonable allocation, the expenses are allocable proportionally between taxable and nontaxable income, with the portion allocated to nontaxable income being nondeductible.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the conveyances of the lots were abandonments, not sales or exchanges, because Jamison had no personal liability for the taxes and received no consideration. The court distinguished these conveyances from forced sales, like foreclosures, which would be considered sales or exchanges under 26 U.S.C. § 117. The court cited Commonwealth, Inc., stating, "Inasmuch as there was in fact no consideration to the petitioner, the transfer of title was not a sale or exchange. The execution of the deed marked the close of a transaction whereby petitioner abandoned its title." Regarding the rental dwelling, the court found it was not a capital asset because it was used in Jamison's rental business and was subject to depreciation. As for office expenses, the court relied on Higgins v. Commissioner, <span normalizedcite="312 U.S. 212“>312 U.S. 212, to determine that the office expenses must be allocated between his real estate business and the management of his investments. The court determined that a proportional allocation was appropriate in the absence of more specific evidence, citing Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr., 2 T.C. 1128.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the distinction between abandonment and sale/exchange for tax purposes. It provides precedent for treating voluntary conveyances of property to taxing authorities as abandonments, allowing for a full ordinary loss deduction when the owner has no personal liability and receives no consideration. It highlights the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

importance of proving the nature of property (capital asset vs. business asset) to determine the appropriate tax treatment of gains or losses upon disposition. The ruling on office expenses emphasizes the need for taxpayers to maintain detailed records to support specific expense allocations between taxable and non-taxable income activities. It remains relevant for tax practitioners advising clients on real estate transactions and expense deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.