Cottingham v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 695 (1975)

To deduct intangible drilling and development costs, taxpayers must prove they hold a working or operating interest in specific oil or gas wells and that their investments are at risk of nonproduction.

Summary

In Cottingham v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court denied deductions for intangible drilling and development costs to investors in a drilling program because they failed to establish ownership of specific wells or that their investments were at risk. Investors entered into contracts with a group of related companies to drill wells, but the companies' administrative failures meant no wells were specifically assigned to individual investors. The court held that without a direct link between investors and specific wells, and with investments seemingly secured by the companies' financial guarantees rather than production risk, the deductions were not allowable under Section 263(c) and related regulations.

Facts

Investors, including Lloyd Cottingham, entered into a drilling program managed by three related companies: Petroleum Equipment Leasing Co. , Oil Field Drilling Co. , and Gas Transmission Organization. Each investor signed a turnkey contract with Drilling for a well at a specified location, paid a downpayment, and financed the remainder through notes to Leasing. Investors also signed equipment leases with Leasing and "take or pay" contracts with Transmission, which guaranteed minimum payments regardless of production. However, the companies, overwhelmed by the volume of contracts, did not assign specific wells to investors, and the guaranteed payments were made from the companies' general funds, not tied to specific well production.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the investors' claimed deductions for intangible drilling and development costs. The investors petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for review. The court had previously considered a similar case involving the same drilling program (Heberer v. Commissioner) and denied deductions there as well. The Tax Court consolidated the Cottingham cases and upheld the Commissioner's disallowance of the deductions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the investors acquired working or operating interests in specific oil or gas properties to qualify for deductions under Section 263(c) and related regulations?
2. Whether the investors placed their investments at risk of nonproduction, as required for the deductions?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the investors failed to prove they held working or operating interests in specific wells.
2. No, because the investors' investments were not at risk of nonproduction due to the companies' financial guarantees.

Court's Reasoning

The court interpreted Section 1. 612-4(a) of the Income Tax Regulations to require that taxpayers hold a working or operating interest in a specific well to elect to deduct intangible drilling and development costs. The court found no evidence linking the investors to specific wells, despite their contracts specifying locations. The court also noted that the investors' payments were not at risk of nonproduction because they were secured by the companies' financial guarantees rather than dependent on actual production. The court rejected the investors' argument of a pooled interest, as there was no evidence of an agreement among investors to pool their interests, and the financial arrangements did not place their investments at risk of future drilling results.

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the importance of establishing a direct link between an investor and a specific well when claiming deductions for intangible drilling and development costs. Taxpayers and their advisors must ensure clear documentation of ownership interests in specific wells and that investments are genuinely at risk of nonproduction. The case also highlights the risks of investing in programs where the financial structure may not align with the legal requirements for tax deductions. Subsequent cases have continued to apply the principle that deductions require a clear connection to specific wells and genuine risk of investment loss.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.