29 T.C. 463 (1957)

Discontinuing active use of business property does not automatically change its character, and the loss on foreclosure of such property remains an ordinary loss, not a capital loss.

Summary

In *Kruse v. Commissioner*, the U.S. Tax Court addressed whether a loss resulting from the foreclosure of a theater building was an ordinary loss or a capital loss. The Kruses, who operated a theater business until March 1952, faced foreclosure proceedings, which culminated in August 1952. They claimed the loss as a capital loss, seeking a carryover to 1954. The court held that because the property had been used in their business, its character as business property did not change when the business ceased operations, and therefore, the loss was ordinary. The court relied on prior cases to establish the principle that merely discontinuing active use of the property did not change its character as business property, which meant the loss was ordinary and could not be carried over to subsequent years as a capital loss.

Facts

In 1950, Alfred and Dorothy Kruse constructed a theater building in Lake Lillian, Minnesota. The property was mortgaged. They operated the theater as a business until March 1952. In July 1951, the mortgagee initiated foreclosure proceedings. A foreclosure sale occurred in August 1951, and the redemption period expired in August 1952. The Kruses did not redeem the property. The Kruses claimed a capital loss from the foreclosure, attempting to carry it over to their 1954 tax return. They had taken depreciation deductions for the theater building on their 1952 tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a tax deficiency for the year 1954, disallowing the capital loss carryover claimed by the Kruses. The Kruses petitioned the United States Tax Court to review the Commissioner’s decision.

Issue(s)

Whether the loss suffered in 1952 on the foreclosure sale of a theater building, which had been previously used in the petitioners’ business, was an ordinary loss or a capital loss, allowing for a carryover to 1954.

Holding

No, because the theater building was business property and the character of the property did not change when the business ceased operations, the loss was ordinary.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court examined whether the property constituted a “capital asset” under Section 117(a)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The court held that the theater building was not a capital asset because it was used in the Kruses’ business. The court determined that the character of the property as business property continued even after the Kruses ceased actively using the property. The court relied on the case of *Solomon Wright, Jr.*, 9 T.C. 173 (1947), where the Tax Court previously held that discontinuance of the active use of business property did not change the character of the property. The court noted that the Kruses provided no evidence of a change in character after the business operations ceased. The court emphasized that the burden was on the Kruses to prove any subsequent change in the asset’s character. The court found that the loss on foreclosure was an ordinary loss. Therefore, it was not eligible for a capital loss carryover to 1954 under Section 117(e)(1). The court stated, “We think there can be no doubt that mere discontinuance of the active use of the property does not change its character previously established as business property.”

Practical Implications

This case underscores that for tax purposes, the status of property as a capital asset or business property is not always determined by its active use at the time of disposition. Instead, it is determined by its prior use. Attorneys advising clients who have suffered losses on property previously used in their business must carefully analyze whether there was a change in the property’s character before the sale or foreclosure. Cases like *Kruse* emphasize that merely ceasing business operations on a property does not automatically convert it into a capital asset. This case is important when determining whether losses on foreclosures or sales of properties are ordinary or capital, impacting the taxpayer’s ability to offset income and the timing of tax benefits. This case emphasizes the importance of considering the entire history of the property to determine its character at the time of the loss and whether the loss is ordinary or capital.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.