T.C. Memo. 1949-261

A taxpayer seeking a casualty loss deduction must demonstrate an actual loss of property, measurable in monetary terms, resulting from the casualty.

Summary

Grant sought a casualty loss deduction under Section 23(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code for expenses related to a temporary contamination of his well water. The Tax Court denied the deduction, holding that Grant failed to prove a measurable loss of property value. The drilling of a new well was considered a capital improvement that enhanced property value, and the cost of temporary water procurement was deemed a personal expense, not a property loss. This case emphasizes the requirement of demonstrating a tangible decrease in property value to qualify for a casualty loss deduction.

Facts

Grant experienced a temporary contamination of his well water for approximately four months in 1946. The cause of the contamination was unclear, but the water eventually cleared up, and Grant resumed using the well. During this period, Grant incurred expenses for drilling a new well ($1,232) and for procuring potable water ($286.40). Grant sought to deduct these expenses as a casualty loss.

Procedural History

Grant petitioned the Tax Court for review after the Commissioner disallowed his claimed casualty loss deduction. The Tax Court reviewed the facts and applicable law to determine the validity of the deduction.

Issue(s)

Whether the expenses incurred for drilling a new well and procuring water during a temporary contamination of the existing well constitute a deductible casualty loss under Section 23(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because Grant failed to demonstrate a measurable loss in property value as a result of a casualty. The cost of drilling a new well was a capital expenditure that enhanced the property’s value, and the cost of procuring water was a personal expense, not a loss of property.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that Section 23(e)(3) requires a loss of property stemming from a casualty, and the loss must be ascertainable and measurable in monetary

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

terms. Citing *Helvering v. Owens*, the court emphasized that a casualty loss deduction requires a "difference" between the property's adjusted basis (or value) before the casualty and its value afterward. The court found that drilling a new well was an improvement, increasing the property's value rather than diminishing it. The $1,232 expenditure created an additional utility (a second well), and, at the very least, it did not diminish the value of the property. Regarding the cost of obtaining water, the court stated, "Section 23 (e) (3) allows deduction only for the loss of property, and in our opinion the expenditure in question does not come within the scope of the section. The petitioner has not introduced evidence which shows the amount of any loss of property." Therefore, the temporary inconvenience and cost of procuring water did not constitute a deductible loss of property.

Practical Implications

Grant v. Commissioner clarifies that a casualty loss deduction requires a tangible, measurable decrease in property value directly attributable to the casualty. Taxpayers cannot deduct expenses that constitute capital improvements or personal expenses incurred as a result of a casualty if those expenses do not reflect an actual reduction in the property's value. This case serves as a reminder that merely experiencing inconvenience or incurring expenses due to a casualty does not automatically qualify for a deduction; a demonstrable loss of property is essential. Later cases apply this principle to disallow deductions where taxpayers fail to adequately prove the decrease in property value caused by the casualty. When assessing casualty losses, attorneys and tax professionals must focus on establishing the property's value before and after the casualty to quantify the actual loss sustained.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.