16 T.C. 1360 (1951)

Damage caused by termites is not considered a loss from "other casualty" under Section 23(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, precluding a tax deduction for such damage.

Summary

Martin Rosenberg sought to deduct expenses related to termite damage in his home under Section 23(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, arguing it qualified as a casualty loss. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction, holding that termite damage does not constitute a casualty within the meaning of the statute. The court reasoned that a casualty, as the term is used in the statute, requires a sudden event, and termite damage represents a gradual deterioration.

Facts

In April 1946, Martin Rosenberg purchased a house after an inspection by a builder and architect, Schlesinger, who deemed it free of termites. Rosenberg moved into the house in September 1946. In April 1947, termites were discovered. The damage was limited to a joist in the basement and parts of a picture window. Rosenberg spent $1,800.74 on repairs and termite treatment and sought to deduct this amount on his 1947 tax return.

Procedural History

Rosenberg filed his 1947 income tax return, claiming a deduction for termite damage. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the deduction, asserting it was not a casualty loss under Section 23(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Rosenberg then petitioned the Tax Court for a review of the Commissioner's decision.

Issue(s)

Whether the damage to the petitioner's property caused by termites constitutes a loss from "other casualty" within the meaning of Section 23(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, thereby entitling him to a deduction.

Holding

No, because termite damage is not considered a "casualty" under Section 23(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, as the term casualty implies a sudden event, and termite damage represents a gradual deterioration, not a sudden loss.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court relied on precedent, specifically citing *United States v. Rogers* and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Fay v. Helvering, which addressed similar claims for casualty loss deductions due to termite damage. The court in *Rogers* interpreted the statute, invoking the doctrine of ejusdem generis, stating: "The doctrine of ejusdem generis requires the statute to be construed as though it read 'loss by fires, storms, shipwrecks, or other casualty of the same kind'. The similar quality of loss by fire, storm or shipwreck is in the suddenness of the loss, so that the doctrine requires us to interpret the statute as though it read 'fires, storms, shipwrecks or other sudden casualty'." The court in *Fay v. Helvering* stated that the term casualty "denotes an accident, a mishap, some sudden invasion by a hostile agency; it excludes the progressive deterioration of property through a steadily operating cause." The Tax Court acknowledged that while *Hale v. Welch* suggested the issue was a question of fact, it disagreed and found the termite damage in Rosenberg's case was not sudden. The court emphasized that the damage occurred sometime between April 1946 and April 1947, without a clear indication of how soon before discovery the damage occurred.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that tax deductions for casualty losses require a sudden, unexpected event, aligning with the nature of fires, storms, and shipwrecks as enumerated in the statute. It clarifies that damage from progressive deterioration, like termite infestations, does not qualify as a casualty loss for tax purposes. Attorneys advising clients on tax matters should be aware of this distinction when evaluating potential casualty loss deductions. This ruling continues to influence how courts interpret "other casualty" under Section 23(e)(3) and its successors, emphasizing the need for a sudden and accidental event to qualify for a deduction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.