Nash v. Commissioner, 60 T. C. 503 (1973)

No demolition loss is allowed if property is purchased with the intent to demolish the building; property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business is not eligible for capital gain treatment.

Summary

William Nash, engaged in buying old houses, demolishing them, and constructing apartment buildings for sale, faced tax issues concerning demolition losses and the tax treatment of property sales. The Tax Court ruled that Nash could not claim a demolition loss for a property purchased with the intent to demolish, as the cost basis must be allocated solely to the land. Additionally, gains from selling apartment buildings were deemed ordinary income, not capital gains, because these properties were held primarily for sale in Nash's business. The court also addressed depreciation limits on rental properties, aligning them with net rental income, and disallowed additional depreciation on an automobile due to the method Nash used to claim expenses.

Facts

William Nash, a former structural engineer turned real estate investor and builder, consistently bought old houses, demolished them, and built apartment buildings on the land. He sought to claim a $6,425 demolition loss for a property at 4619 Wakeley Street, which he had purchased in June 1966 and demolished in December of the same year. Nash also reported gains from selling apartment buildings as capital gains and claimed depreciation on both houses and apartments, as well as on an automobile, using different methods for expense deduction.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Nash's federal income tax for the years 1966-1968. Nash petitioned the United States Tax Court, which held that Nash's intent at the time of purchase to demolish the building at 4619 Wakeley Street precluded a demolition loss deduction. The court also ruled that the gains from selling apartment buildings were ordinary income because they were held for sale in Nash's business. Depreciation deductions were limited to net rental income for properties intended for demolition, and Nash's automobile depreciation was disallowed due to his chosen method of expense deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Nash is entitled to claim a loss of $6,425 on his 1966 Federal income tax return due to the demolition of a house at 4619 Wakeley Street.
2. Whether the gain of $13,718. 80 realized by Nash on the sale of an apartment building at 4620 Wakeley Street is taxable as ordinary income or capital gain.
3. Whether Nash is entitled to depreciation deductions on various houses and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

apartment buildings for the taxable years 1966 through 1968.
4. Whether Nash is entitled to a depreciation deduction of $322. 58 in 1968 on an automobile.

Holding

1. No, because Nash acquired the property at 4619 Wakeley Street with the intent to demolish the building, making the cost basis allocable solely to the land.
2. Yes, because the apartment building at 4620 Wakeley Street was held primarily for sale to customers in Nash's ordinary course of business, thus the gain is taxable at ordinary income rates.
3. No, because the single-family homes were acquired with the intent to demolish, and depreciation is limited to the extent of net rental income. Additionally, the undepreciated basis of demolished homes cannot be added to the basis of newly constructed apartment buildings. However, the apartment at 4801 Underwood Street was held for investment, allowing full depreciation.
4. No, because Nash elected to claim automobile expenses based on a fixed rate per mile, which precludes him from claiming an additional depreciation deduction.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied IRS regulations and case law to determine that no part of the purchase price for property intended for demolition at the time of purchase can be allocated to the building, resulting in no basis for claiming a demolition loss. The court relied on Nash's consistent business practice of buying, demolishing, and selling properties to conclude that the apartment buildings were held primarily for sale, disqualifying them from capital gain treatment. The court also upheld the regulation limiting depreciation to net rental income for properties acquired with the intent to demolish. Finally, the court disallowed the automobile depreciation deduction due to Nash's election to use the mileage rate method for expense deductions, which excludes additional depreciation claims.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that if property is purchased with the intent to demolish, the entire purchase price is allocated to the land, disallowing demolition loss deductions. It also reinforces that property held for sale in the ordinary course of business does not qualify for capital gains treatment, impacting how real estate developers and investors should structure their transactions and report income. The ruling on depreciation limits emphasizes the importance of aligning deductions with actual income, especially for properties held temporarily. Taxpayers should be cautious in choosing methods for claiming automobile expenses, as electing a fixed rate per mile precludes additional depreciation deductions. This case has been cited in subsequent rulings, including cases like *Canterbury v. Commissioner*, to distinguish between properties held for sale and those held for investment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.