***New Pittsburgh Coal Mining Co. v. Commissioner*, 127 F. Supp. 220 (1954)**

A mine is in the "development stage" when the primary activity is the construction of facilities for future mining, even if some production occurs, and expenditures exceeding receipts are capital expenditures.

**Summary**

The New Pittsburgh Coal Mining Co. contested the Commissioner's determination that certain expenditures for mine development in 1947 and 1948 should be capitalized rather than expensed. The court addressed whether the mine was in a "development stage" or a "producing status" under Treasury regulations. Despite producing substantial coal during this period, the court found the primary activity was the construction of new entryways to access the main coal body, thereby classifying the mine as in the development stage. The court held that the costs associated with the construction of these entryways should be treated as capital expenditures.

**Facts**

New Pittsburgh Coal Mining Co. operated Mine No. 4. During 1947 and 1948, the company was driving entryways and airways. While this was occurring, the mine was also producing coal from the entryways. The company argued that the costs incurred during this period were operating expenses, as the mine was past the development stage. The IRS disagreed, asserting that the mine was still in the development stage and that the expenditures should be treated as capital expenditures.

**Procedural History**

The case originated with a determination by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The taxpayer, New Pittsburgh Coal Mining Co., challenged this determination. The case was heard in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. The court ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

**Issue(s)**

Whether, during 1947 and 1948, the petitioner's Mine No. 4 was in a "development stage" or in a "producing status" within the meaning of the applicable Treasury regulations.

**Holding**

Yes, the court held that during 1947 and 1948, the mine was in a "development stage" because the major activity was the construction of new entryways and airways to access the main coal body. The associated expenditures were thus capital expenditures.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

## Court’s Reasoning

The court relied on Treasury Regulation 29.23(m)-15, which defines when a mine transitions from a “development stage” to a “producing status.” The regulation states that a mine is in the development stage until “the major portion of the mineral production is obtained from workings other than those opened for the purpose of development, or when the principal activity of the mine becomes the production of developed ore rather than the development of additional ores for mining.” The court looked to the primary purpose of the work being done. The fact that some coal was produced during this period was not dispositive. Instead, the court focused on the purpose of the work done: the construction of entryways to access the main body of coal. The court cited Guanacevi Mining Co. v. Commissioner, 127 F.2d 49, which established that a mine could return to the development stage if new work was necessary to access previously mined ore. The court found that the situation was analogous to the situation in Guanacevi, where new tunnels were necessary for mining low-grade ore. The expenditures were made for attaining future output, not maintaining existing output. The court also considered the amount of the expenditure, and whether it was required to develop the mine.

## Practical Implications

This case is critical for understanding the distinction between development and production for mining operations, especially regarding the proper treatment of expenditures. It shows that the IRS and the courts consider the *primary purpose* of the work. Mining companies must carefully document their activities to establish whether expenditures are for development or production. They need to demonstrate whether an expenditure is for attaining an output of the mineral or for maintaining an existing output, and also consider how the mine operates, including methods of mining and the purpose of the work completed. It emphasizes that even with some production, if the primary goal is to create access to new ore, the expenses are likely considered capital expenditures. The case offers guidance for tax planning in the mining industry, underlining the importance of determining when a mine is in the development stage to correctly handle expenditures and take advantage of the appropriate tax benefits.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 