Michaelis v. Commissioner, 54 T. C. 1175 (1970)

Basis and depreciable interest are not synonymous; a lease is not a depreciable asset unless it is a premium lease.

Summary

In Michaelis v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that LeBelle Michaelis could not amortize her basis in a lease inherited from her deceased husband, Elo Michaelis. The couple had leased community property land and granted an option to purchase it. After Elo's death, his half of the lease and option were included in his estate tax return. LeBelle sought to amortize her basis in Elo's half of the lease over its remaining term. The court held that without evidence of a premium lease (rent above fair market value), the lease was not a depreciable asset, as the land itself was not depreciable. The court emphasized that basis and depreciable interest are distinct concepts, and LeBelle's interest in the lease did not qualify for amortization under Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Facts

LeBelle and Elo Michaelis owned 400 acres of land in Arkansas as community property. On December 27, 1962, they leased the land to Steel Canning Co. for 10 years, receiving $15,000 initially and $20,000 annually thereafter. Concurrently, they sold an option to purchase the land to Steele Investment Co. for $5,000, exercisable between February 1, 1973, and March 31, 1973. Elo died on December 14, 1963, and his half of the lease and option were included in his estate tax return, valued at $156,792. 30 and $38,171. 30 respectively. LeBelle inherited Elo's interest and sought to amortize her basis in the lease over its remaining term, claiming deductions for 1964-1967.

Procedural History

LeBelle Michaelis filed petitions with the U. S. Tax Court challenging deficiencies determined by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for tax years 1964-1967. The Commissioner disallowed LeBelle's claimed amortization deductions. The case was consolidated, and the Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, disallowing the deductions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether LeBelle Michaelis may amortize her basis in the lease received from her deceased husband under Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the lease was not a depreciable asset. The court found that LeBelle's interest in the lease did not qualify as a wasting asset, and thus, she could not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

amortize her basis under Section 167.

Court’s Reasoning

The court distinguished between basis and depreciable interest, stating that a basis alone does not entitle a taxpayer to a depreciation deduction. The court cited Ninth Circuit case law to support the principle that only a depreciable interest in exhausting property qualifies for depreciation. The court determined that the lease in question was not a premium lease, as there was no evidence that the rent exceeded fair market value. The court emphasized that the land itself was not a depreciable asset, and upon termination of the lease, the lessor would regain full title without any diminution. The court also noted that the valuation of the lease and option in Elo’s estate tax return was merely a factor in determining the land’s value. The court rejected LeBelle’s argument that the option’s potential exercise would make the lease a wasting asset, citing the speculative nature of the option’s exercise.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that a lease interest is not inherently depreciable and that a taxpayer must demonstrate a premium lease to claim amortization. Attorneys should advise clients to carefully document any premium paid above fair market value when leasing property to support depreciation claims. The ruling also underscores the importance of distinguishing between basis and depreciable interest, particularly in estate planning and tax strategy. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the principle that only specific types of leases qualify for amortization. This decision impacts how lessors value and report lease interests in estate tax returns and how they approach depreciation for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.