Schubert v. Commissioner, 33 T.C. 1048 (1960)

A life beneficiary of a testamentary trust is not entitled to a depreciation deduction for a building constructed on leased land where the lease term extends beyond the building's useful life, and the beneficiary's economic interest is limited to the receipt of ground rent.

Summary

The case concerns a life beneficiary of a trust holding land leased for a long term, on which the tenant constructed a building. The court addressed the beneficiary's claims for depreciation and amortization regarding the building and the lease's premium value. The Tax Court held that the beneficiary could not claim depreciation on the building because her economic interest was limited to the ground rent, and she suffered no economic loss from the building's wear and tear. The court also denied amortization of the lease's premium value, treating the lease interest as merged with the fee interest. Finally, the court determined that a statute of limitations did not bar the assessment of a deficiency.

Facts

Gazelle K. Millhiser leased real estate in Richmond, Virginia, to G. C. Murphy Company under a long-term lease. The lease allowed the tenant to demolish existing buildings and construct a new department store, which the tenant did. Millhiser died, and the property was placed in a trust, with her daughter, Rosalie M. Schubert, as the life beneficiary. The trustee reported the net rents from the property, which were calculated after deductions for real estate taxes, insurance, commissions, and depreciation. Schubert claimed depreciation deductions for the building, as well as amortization of what she perceived as a premium value of the lease. The IRS disallowed these deductions, leading to a tax deficiency dispute.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Schubert's income tax for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955. Schubert contested these deficiencies in the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court reviewed the case, considering the implications of prior cases concerning depreciation deductions in similar situations. The court ultimately ruled in favor of the Commissioner, denying Schubert's claimed deductions. A dissenting opinion was filed by Judge Opper, joined by Judge Drennen.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioner, as the beneficiary of a testamentary trust, is entitled to a deduction for depreciation of the building on the leased property.

2. Whether the petitioner is entitled to amortize the purported premium value of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

lease.

3. Whether any deficiency for the year 1953 is barred by I.R.C. 1939, § 275(b).

Holding

1. No, because the petitioner's interest in the property was limited to receiving ground rents and she suffered no economic loss from the building's depreciation.

2. No, because the court found no justification to separate the lease's favorable value from the overall value of the realty, treating the lease interest as merged into the fee.

3. No, because the statute of limitations under I.R.C. 1939, § 275(b) does not apply to the time of assessment of a deficiency in the individual return of a taxpayer.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied heavily on the precedent established in *Albert L. Rowan*, where it was held that a taxpayer could not take depreciation on a building if the lease term extended beyond the building's useful life and the taxpayer's economic loss from the building was zero. The court noted that the petitioner received ground rent, not rent from the building itself. The court cited *Commissioner v. Moore* to support the principle that the depreciation deduction is available only to those who suffer economic loss from a wasting asset. Because the petitioner's interest was limited to the ground rental, she did not suffer such a loss. The court rejected the argument for amortizing any premium value of the lease, stating that to do so would improperly separate the favorable lease value from the overall value of the realty.

The court also found that I.R.C. 1939, § 275(b) was not applicable to bar assessment of the tax deficiency.

The dissenting opinion focused on the idea of a new basis at the devisee level and that a failure to consider this resulted in denying the petitioner the opportunity to recover her basis.

Practical Implications

This case is critical for determining whether a taxpayer can claim depreciation deductions on property where the taxpayer owns the land but not the building. It underscores the importance of examining the economic substance of the transaction to determine whether a taxpayer actually suffers a loss from wear and tear. In situations involving leased land and improvements, the court will examine the nature of the beneficiary's interest, and the court is likely to deny the depreciation deduction where the beneficiary only receives ground rents, with the tenant responsible for the building. This decision also clarifies the IRS's position on not allowing amortization of favorable leases on inherited property, which merges the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

lease’s value into the property’s overall value for tax purposes. The case also emphasizes the limited nature of the statute of limitations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.