Clarence E. Feller v. Commissioner, 33 T.C. 886 (1960)

A farmer using the cash method of accounting can deduct prepaid expenses for feed in the year of payment if the expenditures are for a specific quantity of feed to be delivered at a future date and there are no restrictions on the farmer's ability to obtain the feed.

Summary

Clarence E. Feller, a farmer, prepaid for feed to be delivered in the following year and deducted these expenses in the year of payment. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed these deductions, arguing they distorted Feller's income. The Tax Court, however, held that the prepaid feed expenses were deductible in the year of payment, as Feller was unconditionally obligated to pay for a specific amount of feed at prices effective on the date of delivery. The court distinguished this case from situations involving deposits or restrictions on obtaining the goods. This decision clarifies the rules for cash-basis farmers who prepay for farming supplies, allowing deductions in the year the expense is incurred, provided the transaction is bona fide and binding.

Facts

Clarence E. Feller, a farmer, reported his income on a cash receipts and disbursements basis. In the tax years at issue, Feller made payments in December for feed to be delivered in the following spring. These payments were not refundable, and the grain dealer was obligated to deliver the feed. There were no conditions on the obligation itself; the only condition related to the quantity of feed. Feller continued this practice in subsequent years, at the suggestion of the revenue agent, taking delivery of the feed in December and storing it on his premises. The Commissioner disallowed the deductions for the prepaid feed expenses in the years of payment, leading to a dispute over the proper timing of the deductions.

Procedural History

The case originated as a dispute between Clarence E. Feller and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue concerning the deductibility of prepaid expenses. The Commissioner disallowed the deductions claimed by Feller for prepaid feed expenses. Feller petitioned the Tax Court for a review of the Commissioner's decision. The Tax Court reviewed the facts, legal arguments, and precedents, ultimately ruling in favor of Feller. The decision was entered under Rule 50, finalizing the court's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether a farmer using the cash method of accounting can deduct prepaid expenses for feed in the year of payment when the payment is for a specific amount of feed to be delivered in a future year, and the farmer has an unconditional obligation to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

purchase the feed?

Holding

Yes, the court held that Feller could deduct the prepaid feed expenses in the year of payment because the expenses were ordinary and necessary for his farming business and were made in exchange for a commitment for future delivery of the feed. The payments were absolute, not refundable deposits, and the grain dealer was unconditionally obligated to deliver the feed.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which allowed deductions for "ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year… in carrying on [a] trade or business." The court distinguished the payments from those found in *R. D. Cravens*, where there were conditions on the payments. The court emphasized that the payments were absolute and that Feller was irrevocably out of pocket the amounts paid. The grain dealer was obligated to deliver a specific quantity of feed. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that allowing the deductions would distort Feller's income, stating that allowing the deductions taken by petitioner in the taxable years would more clearly reflect his income than their disallowance.

The court observed, "These circumstances distinguish the instant case from *R. D. Cravens*, 30 T.C. 903."

The court cited the general rule that deductions are allowable in the year of payment, regardless of whether taxpayers are on a cash or accrual basis. The court considered the commercial reality of the transaction, noting that there was no indication that the transactions had no commercial meaning or sense other than as a tax dodge. The court also referenced that the grain dealer treated these payments as income and that the manner in which the grain dealer treated these payments was not relevant to a determination of petitioners' tax liability. The court found that disallowing the deductions would distort Feller's income more than allowing them.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance for farmers who prepay for supplies and are on a cash accounting method. It allows for the deduction of prepaid expenses in the year of payment if the expenses are for a specific quantity of goods and there are no restrictions that would prevent the taxpayer from obtaining those goods. The ruling clarifies that the deductibility of these expenses depends on the nature of the transaction and whether it represents a true expense. This case can guide farmers and their tax advisors in structuring transactions and preparing tax returns. It informs the analysis of similar situations, particularly regarding the timing of expense deductions for farmers. This case is frequently cited in later cases

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

addressing the deductibility of prepaid expenses in agriculture and similar businesses. The decision confirms the importance of a clear contractual obligation for goods to be delivered.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.