32 T.C. 1304 (1959)

A taxpayer may deduct a loss resulting from termite damage to a personal residence as a casualty loss under Internal Revenue Code Section 165(c)(3) if the damage occurred with sufficient suddenness to meet the requirements of a casualty.

Summary

The Kilroes purchased a home in Florida in 1953 and maintained annual termite inspections under contract. In April 1955, they discovered extensive termite damage to their kitchen. The Tax Court addressed whether this damage qualified as a "casualty loss" under Section 165(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, allowing a deduction. The court held that the damage, although caused by termites, occurred with sufficient suddenness given the short time frame between the last inspection and the discovery of the damage, and the lack of prior exterior evidence, thus qualifying for the deduction. The court emphasized that the invasion of termites and subsequent damage had to occur in a relatively short period of time, distinguishing the case from those where damage occurred over several years.

Facts

In May 1953, the Kilroes purchased a home in Winter Park, Florida. An inspection at the time revealed some old termite damage. They contracted for annual termite inspections, the last of which occurred in January 1955. In February or March 1955, they noticed plaster falling from a kitchen wall. In late April 1955, they discovered extensive termite damage to the kitchen walls, floor, and cabinets. Fresh termite channels were found at the time. There was no exterior evidence of damage prior to the discovery in April 1955. The Kilroes sought to deduct the repair costs as a casualty loss.

Procedural History

The Kilroes filed separate income tax returns for 1955, claiming a casualty loss deduction. The IRS disallowed the deduction. The Kilroes filed an amended joint return. The case was heard by the United States Tax Court, where the court determined that the damage from termites constituted a casualty loss. A dissenting opinion was filed as well as a concurring opinion.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the termite damage to the Kilroes' residence constituted a "casualty" within the meaning of Section 165(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

2. Whether, if a casualty loss is allowed, it is deductible for the year 1955.

3. What was the amount of the loss allowable.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found the termite damage to have occurred with sufficient suddenness to be considered a casualty.

2. Yes, because the damage was found to have occurred in 1955, the year in which the loss was discovered.

3. The Tax Court determined the amount of the loss to be $2,042.88, based on repair costs incurred by the Kilroes.

Court’s Reasoning

The court examined whether the termite damage met the “suddenness” requirement of a casualty loss. The court acknowledged that the term “suddenness” is comparative, looking at the rapidity of the damage and when the damage was detected. The court distinguished this case from others where termite damage deductions were disallowed, where there was a lack of demonstrated suddenness of the losses. The court emphasized that the inspection had been made in 1953 and annual inspections were made thereafter. The court found that based on the facts, the time within which the damage or loss occurred was within a relatively short time prior to discovery in 1955. The court referenced Technical Information Release, No. 142, where the Internal Revenue Service announced its policy of allowing deductions when the infestation and damage occurred in a short amount of time and denying them when they occurred over several years. The court noted that the amount of the casualty loss should be the difference between the fair market value before the casualty and the fair market value immediately after, with the cost of repair being used as a reasonable estimate of the loss of value.

The dissent argued that termite damage is not a casualty loss. Termite damage is a result of the progressive deterioration of property through a steadily operating cause and does not result from some sudden cause or accident which is unforeseeable and not preventable.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on the circumstances under which termite damage can be considered a casualty loss for tax purposes. The decision emphasizes the importance of:

1.
Establishing the suddenness of the damage. The court focused on the time frame between inspections and the discovery of significant damage.

2.
Demonstrating the lack of prior evidence of damage. The absence of exterior signs of termite activity was a key factor.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

3.
Supporting the timing of the damage. The Kilroes' evidence of recent termite activity helped establish the year the loss was sustained.

This ruling impacted legal practice as it was determined the initial invasion and subsequent damage had to occur in a relatively short period of time. This case has been cited in later cases, particularly those involving other forms of property damage and insurance claims, where the determination of "suddenness" is at issue. This case is often cited in support of the IRS's position on what is, and is not, a casualty.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.