Waxenberg v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 594 (1974)

A foreign tax imposed on the occupancy of real property is not deductible as a foreign real property tax under section 164(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

The Waxenbergs, U. S. taxpayers, sought to deduct UK rates taxes paid on leased London premises as foreign real property taxes. The Tax Court held that the UK rates tax, which was imposed on the occupier rather than the property itself, was not deductible. The court reasoned that an occupancy tax is an excise tax, not a property tax, as it targets the use of property rather than ownership. This decision underscores the distinction between taxes on property ownership and taxes on specific property uses, impacting how similar foreign taxes are analyzed for U. S. tax purposes.

Facts

The Waxenbergs, U. S. residents, lived in leased premises in London, UK, during the years 1965-1968. They paid UK rates taxes as required by their lease. These taxes, assessed under the UK General Rate Act of 1967, were levied on the occupier of the property. The Waxenbergs claimed deductions for these payments as foreign real property taxes on their U. S. federal income tax returns. The Commissioner disallowed the deductions, asserting that the UK rates tax was not a deductible real property tax under section 164(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

The Waxenbergs petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to challenge the Commissioner's disallowance of their claimed deductions for the UK rates taxes. The Tax Court, after reviewing the case, ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that the UK rates tax did not qualify as a deductible foreign real property tax.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the UK rates tax, imposed on the occupier of real property, constitutes a deductible foreign real property tax under section 164(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the UK rates tax is an excise tax on the privilege of occupying or using real property, rather than a tax on an interest in real property, and thus does not qualify as a deductible foreign real property tax.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court analyzed the nature of the UK rates tax under U. S. tax law concepts, concluding it was an excise tax rather than a property tax. The court relied on the distinction between taxes on property ownership and taxes on specific uses or privileges associated with property, as established in U. S. constitutional and statutory law. The court cited *Bromley v. McCaughn* and other cases to support the principle that a tax on occupancy is an excise, not a direct tax on property. The court further noted that the UK rates tax was assessed based on the rental value of the property, indicating it was a tax on the privilege of occupation rather than the underlying value of the property. This reasoning led the court to conclude that the UK rates tax did not fall within the definition of a deductible foreign real property tax under section 164(a)(1).

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for a foreign tax to be deductible as a real property tax under U. S. tax law, it must be imposed on an interest in the property itself, not merely on its use or occupancy. Practitioners advising clients with foreign property interests should carefully analyze the nature of foreign taxes to determine their deductibility. The ruling may affect how U. S. taxpayers structure leases and other arrangements involving foreign real property to manage tax liabilities. Subsequent cases have applied this principle, reinforcing the distinction between taxes on property ownership and taxes on property use. This case also underscores the importance of understanding the specific provisions of foreign tax laws and how they align with U. S. tax concepts when advising on international tax matters.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.