

## ***Opine Timber Co. v. Commissioner, 68 T. C. 709 (1977)***

Delay rentals under a mineral lease constitute passive investment income for a small business corporation, leading to termination of its election to be taxed under Section 1372 if such income exceeds 20% of gross receipts.

### **Summary**

Opine Timber Co. elected to be taxed as a small business corporation in 1958. The IRS determined deficiencies for the years 1969-1971, claiming the election terminated in 1968 due to passive investment income exceeding 20% of gross receipts. The court held that delay rentals received under an oil and gas lease were passive investment income, causing the election's termination in 1963. The court also ruled that a 1974 retroactive election was invalid and upheld the IRS's right to reassess the 1969 tax year despite an initial acceptance.

### **Facts**

Opine Timber Co. elected to be taxed as a small business corporation under Section 1372 in 1958. In 1961, it executed an oil and gas lease with John M. Gray, Jr. , receiving annual delay rentals of \$2,960. 50 for 1961-1964 and \$2,958. 50 for 1965-1968. These payments were reported as rents. In 1972, the IRS informed Opine Timber that its 1969 tax return was accepted as filed, but later reopened the examination and determined deficiencies for 1969-1971, asserting the election terminated in 1968 due to passive investment income exceeding 20% of gross receipts.

### **Procedural History**

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency to Opine Timber for the years 1969-1971. Opine Timber challenged this determination in the U. S. Tax Court, arguing the election did not terminate and that the IRS's reopening of the 1969 tax year was improper. The Tax Court held that the election terminated in 1963 due to delay rentals constituting passive investment income, rejected the validity of a 1974 retroactive election, and upheld the IRS's right to reassess the 1969 tax year.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether the delay rentals received by Opine Timber under the oil and gas lease constituted "rents" within the meaning of Section 1372(e)(5), leading to the termination of its small business corporation election?
2. Whether Opine Timber's 1974 election to be taxed as a small business corporation was valid and retroactive to the years in issue?
3. Whether the IRS improperly conducted a second audit of Opine Timber's 1969 tax liability?

### **Holding**

1. Yes, because the delay rentals were payments for the use of or right to use Opine Timber's property, constituting passive investment income under Section 1372(e)(5) and terminating the election in 1963.
2. No, because the election was not valid as it was not filed within the required time frame and could not be retroactive.
3. No, because the IRS had the authority to reassess the 1969 tax year despite the initial acceptance of the return.

### **Court's Reasoning**

The court determined that delay rentals under the oil and gas lease were "rents" within Section 1372(e)(5), as they were payments for the right to use Opine Timber's property. The court rejected the relevance of Alabama law, focusing instead on the federal tax definition of "rents." The court cited regulations defining "rents" as amounts received for the use of or right to use property and emphasized that delay rentals were compensation for the right to defer drilling operations. The court also rejected Opine Timber's argument that the payments were for the purchase of minerals, noting they were for maintaining Gray's rights without drilling. The 1974 election was deemed invalid because it was not filed within the statutory time frame and could not be retroactive. The court upheld the IRS's right to reassess 1969, citing precedent that the initial acceptance of a return does not preclude later reassessment.

### **Practical Implications**

This decision clarifies that delay rentals under mineral leases are considered passive investment income for small business corporations, potentially terminating their Section 1372 election if such income exceeds 20% of gross receipts. Legal practitioners advising small business corporations should ensure clients understand the implications of entering into mineral leases and monitor their income sources closely. The ruling also reinforces the IRS's authority to reassess previously accepted tax returns, highlighting the importance of maintaining accurate records and being prepared for potential audits. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling to similar situations, emphasizing the need for corporations to be aware of the tax consequences of their income sources.