E.W. Edwards & Sons v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1955-2 (1955)

A taxpayer on an accrual basis cannot deduct an estimated expense unless the liability is fixed, certain, and reasonably ascertainable.

Summary

E.W. Edwards & Sons sought to deduct an accrued expense related to potential title defects in land it had transferred. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction because the liability for the expense was not fixed and certain in the tax year. While the taxpayer knew of potential issues, no claims had been pressed, no work had been done to correct the issues, and the obligation to pay was uncertain. The court emphasized that accrual requires a definite and certain obligation, not just a possibility of future expense.

Facts

E.W. Edwards & Sons (the transferor) had an agency contract with Commonwealth, Inc. to insure titles. The transferor was aware, since 1935, that descriptions of land in a certain area were erroneous. In 1945, a title holder, Meyers, notified the transferor of a potential defect in his title. The transferor discussed the matter with a surveyor and an attorney and estimated the cost of resurveying and legal services to be $5,000. However, no contracts were entered into, and no work was performed. The transferor was dissolved in 1947, and the taxpayer, E.W. Edwards & Sons, attempted to deduct the $5,000 as an accrued expense.

Procedural History

The Commissioner disallowed the deduction. E.W. Edwards & Sons petitioned the Tax Court for review of the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether a taxpayer on an accrual basis can deduct an estimated expense for resurveying land and legal services related to potential title defects when the liability is not fixed and certain, and no work has been performed.

Holding

No, because the liability was not fixed and certain in the tax year, and there was uncertainty that the work would ever be performed.

Court's Reasoning

The court distinguished the case from *Harrold v. Commissioner*, 192 F.2d 1002 (where a deduction was allowed for the cost of backfilling strip-mined land), emphasizing that in *Harrold*, the obligation to restore the land was contractually

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

required and the work was certain to be performed. Here, no work had been done and Meyers had not pressed the matter. The court cited *Pacific Grape Products Co., 17 T.C. 1097*, stating, "The general rule is well established that the expenses are deductible in the period in which the fact of the liability therefor becomes fixed and certain." The court found that the obligation to pay was not definite and certain and that the evidence suggested no obligation to pay would ever occur, because the work might never be performed. The court stated, "An obligation to perform services at some indefinite time in the future will not justify the current deduction of a dollar amount as an accrual."

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that accrual basis taxpayers can only deduct expenses when the liability is fixed, definite, and reasonably ascertainable. It clarifies that mere awareness of a potential future expense is insufficient. This decision highlights the importance of enforceable contracts or legal obligations to support an accrual. Taxpayers must demonstrate a reasonable certainty that the expense will be incurred to justify its accrual. The ruling impacts how businesses account for potential liabilities, requiring a rigorous assessment of the likelihood of the expense actually occurring. Later cases have cited this ruling to disallow deductions for contingent or uncertain liabilities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.