Victory Sand & Concrete, Inc. v. Commissioner, 61 T. C. 407 (1974)

A taxpayer extracting sand and gravel from a riverbed may claim percentage depletion deductions if the deposits are diminishing in quality and quantity, despite some replenishment.

Summary

Victory Sand & Concrete, Inc. , extracted sand and gravel from the Kansas River under a state contract. The IRS denied their percentage depletion deductions, arguing the deposits were not exhaustible due to river replenishment. The Tax Court held that the company had an economic interest in the deposits, which were diminishing in quality and quantity due to upstream dams, thus qualifying as a wasting asset for depletion purposes. This case establishes that even partially replenished mineral deposits can be considered depletable if their economic viability is decreasing.

Facts

Victory Sand & Concrete, Inc. , operated a sand and gravel extraction business on the Kansas River under a contract with the Kansas Department of Revenue. The company's right to extract was exclusive within a designated area. The riverbed sand was initially virgin, but this was exhausted by the early 1940s. Subsequent extraction relied on sand replenished by river flow, which decreased in quality and quantity after flood control dams were built upstream. The company sought percentage depletion deductions for the years 1967-1969, which the IRS denied, claiming the deposits were not exhaustible.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in Victory Sand's federal corporate income tax for 1967-1969, denying their claimed depletion deductions. Victory Sand petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for relief. The Tax Court, after reassignment to Judge Drennen, held a trial and ultimately ruled in favor of Victory Sand, allowing the depletion deductions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Victory Sand & Concrete, Inc. had an economic interest in the sand and gravel deposits of the Kansas River sufficient to claim percentage depletion deductions?
2. Whether the sand and gravel deposits in the Kansas River were exhaustible, thus qualifying as a depletable asset?

Holding

1. Yes, because Victory Sand had an economic interest in the deposits due to its

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

ownership of adjacent land essential for extraction and its exclusive contract with the state.
2. Yes, because although the deposits were replenished to some extent by the river, the quality and quantity of the replenishment were diminishing, making the deposits a wasting asset.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the economic interest doctrine established in *Palmer v. Bender* and *Commissioner v. Southwest Exploration Co.* , finding that Victory Sand's ownership of land essential for extraction and its exclusive extraction rights constituted an economic interest. The court also considered the depletion statutes and case law, which require a mineral deposit to be exhaustible for depletion deductions. Despite some replenishment by the river, the court found the sand and gravel deposits to be diminishing in quality and quantity, particularly after the construction of upstream dams. The court cited *United States v. Ludey* and *Don C. Day* to support the notion that partial replenishment does not render a deposit inexhaustible if its economic viability is decreasing. Judge Quealy dissented, arguing that the deposits were not proven to be exhaustible due to ongoing replenishment.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that even partially replenished mineral deposits can qualify for depletion deductions if their quality or quantity is diminishing, affecting how similar cases involving riverbed or other natural resource extraction should be analyzed. It may encourage businesses to claim depletion on resources that are economically depleting, despite some natural replenishment. The ruling could impact how depletion is calculated for other minerals where replenishment is a factor. Subsequent cases, like *Arthur E. Reich*, have applied similar reasoning to other types of natural resources, showing the broad applicability of this principle.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.