Airport Bldg. Development Corp. v. Commissioner, 58 T. C. 538 (1972)

The economic useful life of leasehold improvements for depreciation purposes is determined by the remaining term of the taxpayer's lease on the property, unless the taxpayer can show a reasonable certainty that the improvements will not be usable beyond a shorter period.

Summary

Airport Building Development Corp. constructed leasehold improvements to accommodate the United States' Defense Contract Administration Services Region (DCASR) in a building on leased airport property. The taxpayer argued for a 5-year depreciation period based on the initial term of the sublease to the U. S. , but the IRS determined a 10-year useful life, matching the remaining term of the taxpayer's lease with the City of Los Angeles. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's determination, ruling that the taxpayer failed to demonstrate a reasonable certainty that the improvements would not be usable beyond the initial 5-year sublease term, given the renewal option and the potential for other tenants.

Facts

Airport Building Development Corp. leased land from the City of Los Angeles and constructed a hangar-type building, which it subleased to North American Aviation, Inc. After North American vacated in 1965, the taxpayer entered into a sublease with the United States for DCASR to use the building as office space. The sublease had a 5-year term with a 5-year renewal option, which the U. S. could terminate with 180 days' notice. The taxpayer made improvements costing approximately $574,383 to convert the building for DCASR's use. The taxpayer claimed depreciation over 5 years, while the IRS determined a 10-year useful life.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency for the fiscal years ending March 31, 1967, and March 31, 1968, asserting that the useful life of the leasehold improvements was 10 years, not 5 years as claimed by the taxpayer. The taxpayer petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's determination, finding the useful life to be 10 years.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the economic useful life of the leasehold improvements constructed by the taxpayer is limited to the 5-year initial term of its sublease to the United States, or extends to the 10-year remaining term of its lease with the City of Los Angeles.

Holding

1. No, because the taxpayer failed to show a reasonable certainty that the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

improvements would not be usable beyond the initial 5-year sublease term, given the renewal option and potential for other tenants.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the rule from Lassen Lumber & Box Co. that a taxpayer must demonstrate a practical certainty that improvements cannot be used in its business beyond the term of a contract to justify a shorter depreciation period. The court found that the taxpayer did not meet this burden. Despite testimony that it would be difficult to find another tenant for the specific improvements if the U. S. did not renew, the court noted that the U. S. had a history of exercising renewal options and that the GSA had an increasing need for space in the area. The court concluded that the taxpayer failed to show a reasonable certainty of nonrenewal or inability to find another tenant, thus upholding the IRS’s 10-year useful life determination. The court emphasized that a possibility or mere probability of nonrenewal was insufficient.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that taxpayers must show a high level of certainty that leasehold improvements will not be usable beyond a contract term to justify a shorter depreciation period. It impacts how similar cases involving leasehold improvements should be analyzed, requiring a focus on the reasonable certainty of the improvements’ future use. Practitioners should carefully document the likelihood of lease renewals and potential alternative uses when determining depreciation periods. The ruling may influence businesses to negotiate longer lease terms or more favorable renewal options when making significant leasehold improvements. Subsequent cases have applied this principle, such as New England Tank Industries, Inc. , reaffirming the need for a practical certainty of non-use beyond the contract term.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.