Trustee Corporation v. Commissioner, 42 T. C. 482 (1964)

Lease termination payments made to facilitate the construction of a new building are capital expenditures amortizable over the life of the new building.

Summary

In Trustee Corporation v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that a $10,000 payment made by the petitioner to terminate a lease with Chevrolet was a capital expenditure. This decision was based on the intent to clear the premises for a new motel venture with TraveLodge. The court held that such payments fall under an exception to the general rule that lease termination payments are capital expenditures amortizable over the unexpired term of the canceled lease. Instead, they are to be amortized over the life of the new building, following precedents like Business Real Estate Trust of Boston and Keiler v. United States. This case underscores the importance of the purpose behind lease termination payments in determining their tax treatment.

Facts

The petitioner, Trustee Corporation, paid Chevrolet $10,000 to vacate a leased property to enable the construction of a new motel in collaboration with TraveLodge. The payment was part of negotiations that began in December 1961 and culminated in an agreement with TraveLodge in February 1962. The payment was made to Chevrolet on March 20, 1962, and the lease with TraveLodge was executed on March 22, 1962. The petitioner argued that the payment was for a new lease with Chevrolet, but the court found it was primarily to facilitate the motel project.

Procedural History

The Tax Court reviewed the case to determine the tax treatment of the $10,000 payment. The respondent, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, determined that the payment was a capital expenditure. The petitioner contested this determination, leading to the trial before the Tax Court. The court ultimately sustained the respondent's determination, ruling that the payment was a capital expenditure to be amortized over the life of the new motel lease.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $10,000 payment made to Chevrolet for lease termination should be treated as a capital expenditure amortizable over the unexpired term of the canceled lease or over the life of the new building constructed on the leased property.

Holding

1. No, because the payment was made to facilitate the construction of a new

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

building for the motel venture, it falls under an established exception and should be amortized over the life of the new building.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the general rule that lease termination payments are capital expenditures but recognized an exception established in cases like Business Real Estate Trust of Boston and Keiler v. United States. These cases held that when payments are made solely to prepare for a new building, they should be added to the cost of the new building and amortized over its life. The court found that the sole purpose of the payment to Chevrolet was to clear the premises for the motel project with TraveLodge, not for the new lease with Chevrolet. The court’s decision was influenced by the policy of treating expenditures that facilitate new business ventures as capital expenditures to be amortized over the life of the new asset. The court quoted from Keiler v. United States, stating, “The payments were made to the tenants to obtain immediate possession so that the new building might be erected. . . and for no other purpose. “

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how lease termination payments are treated for tax purposes, particularly when they are made to facilitate new construction. Attorneys and tax professionals should analyze the purpose behind such payments to determine whether they fall under the exception to the general rule. This case may lead to more careful documentation of the intent behind lease termination payments to support favorable tax treatment. Businesses planning to terminate leases for new ventures should consider the tax implications and structure their payments accordingly. Subsequent cases, such as Cosmopolitan Corporation v. Commissioner, have applied this ruling to similar situations where payments were made to prepare for new construction projects.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.