13 T.C. 705 (1949)

Under Section 127(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, a taxpayer is required to adjust the basis of property for depreciation purposes due to a war loss; no depreciation deduction is allowed until the basis is restored through recoveries after the war's end.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether a taxpayer could deduct depreciation on buildings in Shanghai after a war loss. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction, arguing that Section 127(a)(2) mandated a basis adjustment due to the war loss. The court held that the taxpayer was not entitled to a depreciation deduction in 1944 because the war loss in 1941 required an adjustment to the property's basis, which had not been restored. This decision reinforces the mandatory nature of basis adjustments for war losses and prevents double recovery of capital through both a loss deduction and subsequent depreciation.

Facts

Ezra Shahmoon, a resident of the United States, owned properties in Shanghai, China, consisting of buildings, shops, and houses. He acquired the properties at Dalny and Ward Roads in 1924 and Yates Road in 1928. He received rents from these properties until the Japanese invasion of Shanghai on December 8, 1941. After the invasion, the Japanese forces took over the properties, and Shahmoon received no rents until he regained possession in 1945.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Shahmoon's 1944 income tax. Shahmoon petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the disallowance of a $20,000 depreciation deduction. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, upholding the disallowance of the depreciation deduction.

Issue(s)

Whether the Commissioner erred in disallowing a deduction for depreciation on buildings in Shanghai, China, owned by the taxpayer, in light of Section 127(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code regarding war losses.

Holding

No, because Section 127(a)(2) creates a mandatory adjustment to the basis of property for depreciation purposes in the event of a war loss, and no depreciation deduction is allowable until the basis is restored through subsequent recoveries.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court relied on Section 127(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, which addresses losses sustained due to war. The court cited *Abraham Albert Andriesse, 12 T.C. 907*, stating the word "deemed" in Section 127(a)(2) creates a conclusive presumption of loss when war is declared. The court reasoned that the scheme of Congress was to allow a deductible loss when war was declared, and then if the property was recovered, it would come into income with a new basis. The court stated, "The only difference between that case and the present case is that the present petitioner is claiming a right to a deduction for depreciation under section 23 (l) instead of loss under section 23 (e) (3). This difference does not distinguish the *Andriesse* case as an authority for the purpose of this case. The basis for depreciation is the same as the basis for gain or loss. Secs. 23 (n), 114 (a), 113 (b). Each is reduced or wiped out by a deduction for loss. The war loss under section 127 (a) (2) wipes out that basis." The court emphasized that a taxpayer cannot recover their basis both as a war loss and through subsequent depreciation deductions.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the mandatory nature of adjusting the basis of property for war losses under Section 127(a)(2). It confirms that taxpayers cannot take depreciation deductions on properties for which a war loss has already been claimed until the basis has been restored through recoveries. This decision prevents taxpayers from receiving a double tax benefit. It also illustrates how the tax code treats war-related property losses differently, requiring a specific accounting treatment that impacts the timing and availability of deductions. Later cases would need to examine whether the war loss requirements have been met and whether any basis has been recovered to permit subsequent depreciation deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.