Blake v. Commissioner, 8 T.C. 546 (1947)

The basis of property for depreciation purposes includes the full amount of borrowed funds used for construction, even if the debt is later satisfied for less than its face value; the reduction in debt is treated as income, separate from the property's basis.

Summary

Blake v. Commissioner addresses the proper basis for depreciation of buildings constructed with borrowed funds when the debt is later satisfied for less than its face value. The Tax Court held that the original cost basis includes the full amount of the borrowed funds used for construction, and that the later discharge of indebtedness at a discount results in taxable income, separate from the depreciation basis. This case clarifies the distinction between the cost of acquiring or constructing an asset and the subsequent discharge of debt related to that asset.

Facts

In 1925, the Blakes purchased land with the intention of building a housing development. They financed the construction of 73 houses with a $125,000 first mortgage. They also spent an additional $9,213.47 on painting and decorating. Due to financial difficulties, a series of transactions occurred involving a quitclaim deed and options to repurchase the property. Ultimately, the Blakes retained possession and control. In 1940, the first mortgage was renewed, and by 1942, it was completely paid off by applying bonds purchased on the open market at a discount ($81,800 face value of bonds purchased for $24,573.53) and a cash payment of $27,200.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue challenged the Blakes' depreciation deductions, arguing that the basis should not include the full amount of the mortgage or, alternatively, should be limited to the actual cost of satisfying the indebtedness. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the basis of the property for depreciation purposes includes the full amount of the $125,000 borrowed and spent on construction, despite subsequent transactions and eventual satisfaction of the debt for less than its face value.
2. Whether the difference between the face value of the bonds and the amount paid to purchase them constitutes taxable income.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the cost basis includes the actual cost of construction, which includes the full amount of borrowed funds used for that purpose.
2. Yes, because the difference between the face amount of the bonds and the purchase price constitutes income to the petitioners.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the Blakes maintained a continuous ownership interest in the property from 1925 onward, despite the various transactions. The court emphasized the importance of considering the economic reality of the situation. It held that the initial cost basis of the buildings includes the $125,000 borrowed for construction and the $9,213.47 spent on painting and decorating, totaling $134,213.47. The court distinguished between the actual cost of constructing the buildings and the subsequent satisfaction of the debt. It stated: "Respondent's attempt to exclude the $125,000 from basis, or at least to limit the basis on account of such sum to the actual cost to petitioners of retiring their indebtedness, therefore is based on a failure to distinguish between actual cost of constructing the buildings, on the one hand, and the retirement of an indebtedness for less than par, on the other." The court further cited *United States v. Kirby Lumber Co.*, 284 U. S. 1, in holding that the difference between the face value and the purchase price of the bonds used to satisfy the mortgage constituted taxable income to the Blakes.

Practical Implications

Blake v. Commissioner provides a clear framework for determining the basis of property when debt is involved in its acquisition or construction. It confirms that the initial cost basis includes the full amount of borrowed funds used, regardless of whether the debt is later satisfied for less than its face value. The case emphasizes that the reduction of debt at less than face value is a separate taxable event, resulting in income. This ruling is critical for tax planning, as it affects both depreciation deductions and the recognition of income from debt discharge. This case continues to be cited as authority in cases involving the determination of basis and the tax consequences of debt forgiveness.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.