Adolf Schwarcz v. Commissioner, 24 T.C. 733 (1955)

War losses, as defined under section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, can be attributed to a trade or business regularly carried on by the taxpayer and thus qualify for net operating loss deductions, even though the loss is deemed to have occurred due to the actions of an enemy of the United States.

Summary

The U.S. Tax Court ruled in favor of Adolf Schwarcz, a U.S. citizen who had sustained war losses on property located in Hungary after the United States declared war on Hungary. The court determined that Schwarcz was entitled to net operating loss deductions for his fiscal year 1944, based on war losses from 1942. The IRS had argued that war losses, being in the nature of casualty losses, were limited to non-business losses under section 122(d)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court rejected this interpretation, holding that war losses, when related to a taxpayer's business, could be included in calculating net operating loss deductions, even if the business was no longer active at the time the war loss was deemed to have occurred. The court also examined which of Schwarcz's losses were business-related.

Facts

Adolf Schwarcz, a former Hungarian resident, became a U.S. citizen in 1948. In 1939, he moved to the U.S., and in 1940, he and his wife decided to become permanent residents. Schwarcz owned apartment buildings and a jewelry business in Hungary. The United States declared war on Hungary on June 5, 1942. Schwarcz's properties in Hungary were affected by the war. Schwarcz also had an account receivable from a jewelry business corporation. Schwarcz filed U.S. individual income tax returns for 1942, 1943, and 1944. During 1942, Schwarcz claimed war losses for the apartment buildings and jewelry business, which the Commissioner initially disallowed. Schwarcz's real estate investments and jewelry were deemed to be lost on the date war was declared.

Procedural History

Schwarcz filed his individual income tax returns for the fiscal years 1942, 1943 and 1944 with the collector of internal revenue. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Schwarcz's income tax for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1944. Schwarcz contested the deficiency and alleged an overpayment. The case was heard in the United States Tax Court, where the court reviewed the IRS's denial of the net operating loss deduction based on the claimed war losses. The Tax Court ultimately ruled in favor of Schwarcz, allowing certain business-related war losses to be included in computing his net operating loss deduction, and allowed further adjustments to the loss calculations under Rule 50.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

Issue(s)

1. Whether war losses, as defined in Section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, could be attributable to a trade or business regularly carried on by the taxpayer, thus permitting a net operating loss deduction.
2. Whether certain war losses were attributable to Schwarcz's business of operating apartment houses or his jewelry business.
3. Whether the IRS was correct in disallowing a net operating loss deduction carried forward to 1944 to the extent the war losses were not attributable to a trade or business regularly carried on by him.

Holding

1. Yes, war losses can be related to a trade or business for net operating loss deduction purposes.
2. Yes, certain war losses were attributable to Schwarcz's business.
3. No, the IRS was incorrect to the extent that the war losses were attributable to Schwarcz's business.

Court's Reasoning

The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that war losses should be treated the same as casualty losses, and therefore, were limited to non-business losses under section 122(d)(5). The court found that war losses could be attributable to a trade or business regularly carried on. The court explained that while war losses are considered casualty losses, they are not subject to the same restrictions as other casualty losses under Section 23(e)(3) because they are presumed to have arisen from a casualty, namely the destruction or seizure of property by the enemy. "We are of the opinion that such an interpretation is wholly unwarranted," stated the court.

The court considered whether Schwarcz's operation of apartment houses and his jewelry business constituted a trade or business. The court held that the operation of rental property may constitute a business and noted that Schwarcz was regularly engaged in the business of operating the apartment buildings and jewelry business. The court further determined that the loss of the account receivable from the jewelry business was attributable to the taxpayer's jewelry business. However, losses related to the gold, silver, diamonds, and watches stored for safekeeping were not attributable to the business.

"To say that a loss of business property deemed to have occurred under section 127 may not be taken into consideration in determining net income because the property may not in fact have been destroyed would be to construe a statute designed to give relief so as to deny the very relief the statute intended." The court highlighted that the purpose of Section 127 was to provide relief to taxpayers in war-affected areas by fixing the date on which losses are presumed to have occurred.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

>Practical Implications</p>

This case established that war losses can be linked to a taxpayer’s trade or business, which is critical for determining the availability of net operating loss deductions. The ruling clarified that the mere fact the loss may not have been directly related to ongoing business operations does not preclude the loss. The case is particularly relevant to taxpayers who had businesses or investments in countries affected by war, even if the business was no longer active at the time the war loss was deemed to occur. This ruling helps to establish that war loss deductions are available for certain business-related losses. The case provides guidance on what qualifies as a trade or business for tax purposes, including the operation of rental properties. This case remains relevant in the interpretation of casualty losses in a business context. The case illustrates how courts determine whether losses are sufficiently related to a business to be deductible.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 