Hudock v. Commissioner, 65 T.C. 351 (1975)

A casualty loss covered by insurance is not recognized for tax purposes until it can be determined with reasonable certainty whether and to what extent insurance reimbursement will be received, regardless of when a partial condemnation award for the same property is received.

Summary

Taxpayers owned rental property, including an apartment building (partially their residence), which was destroyed by fire in 1968. They had an insurance claim and the property was condemned in the same year. In 1969, they received a partial condemnation award and claimed a casualty loss on their tax return, estimating insurance recovery. The Tax Court held that no loss could be recognized in 1969 because the insurance claim was still unresolved. The condemnation gain/loss must be calculated separately, excluding the fire-damaged building's basis, as the insurance claim for the fire loss was not settled until 1971. The court also upheld the IRS allocation of the condemnation award and found no basis for a closing agreement or equitable estoppel based on a Form 4549.

Facts

Petitioners owned property with an apartment building (partially personal residence), a rental double home, and a garage.

The apartment building was destroyed by fire on February 14, 1968, and was insured for $50,000.

On October 4, 1968, the Redevelopment Authority condemned the property.

Petitioners initiated litigation for both the fire insurance claim and the condemnation award.

In 1969, petitioners received $20,000 as an estimated condemnation award and claimed a loss on their 1969 tax return related to the condemnation, estimating a partial insurance recovery from the fire.

In 1971, petitioners received $48,000 to settle the fire insurance claim.

In 1972, they received an additional $15,000 to settle the condemnation claim.

Procedural History

The IRS audited petitioners' 1969 return and initially proposed adjustments based on Form 4549, which petitioners paid.

The District Director did not accept Form 4549 as a closing agreement.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

In 1973, the IRS issued a statutory notice of deficiency for 1969, disallowing the claimed condemnation loss and related rental expenses.

Petitioners challenged the deficiency in Tax Court, arguing for loss recognition in 1969, a different allocation of the condemnation award, and that Form 4549 acted as a closing agreement or created equitable estoppel.

Issue(s)

1. Whether petitioners realized a recognizable loss in 1969 upon receipt of a partial condemnation award, considering a prior fire casualty and pending insurance claim on the condemned property.

2. Whether petitioners properly allocated the condemnation award between rental and personal portions of the property.

3. Whether Form 4549 constituted a closing agreement under Section 7121 I.R.C. 1954, or whether equitable estoppel barred the Commissioner from assessing a deficiency for 1969.

Holding

1. No, because a casualty loss covered by insurance is not sustained for tax purposes until it can be ascertained with reasonable certainty whether reimbursement will be received. Since the insurance claim was unresolved in 1969, no loss related to the fire-damaged building could be recognized in that year for condemnation loss calculation.

2. No, because petitioners did not provide sufficient evidence to overturn the Commissioner's allocation, which was based on the ratio of basis allocated to rental and personal property.

3. No, neither Section 7121 nor equitable estoppel bars the deficiency assessment because Form 4549 is not a closing agreement and was not accepted by the District Director, and petitioners did not demonstrate detrimental reliance to support equitable estoppel.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that under Treasury Regulations Section 1.165-1(d)(2)(i), a casualty loss is not deductible in the year of the casualty if there is a reasonable prospect of insurance recovery. Recognition is deferred until it's reasonably certain whether reimbursement will be received, typically upon settlement, adjudication, or abandonment of the claim.

The court emphasized that the fire loss and condemnation were separate events requiring separate gain/loss calculations. Because the insurance claim was

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

unresolved in 1969, the basis of the fire-damaged apartment building could not be included in calculating the condemnation gain or loss in 1969. The court stated, “To recognize such a gain or loss in 1969 would be to anticipate the event which would ultimately determine the gain or loss, which is not permissible.”

Regarding allocation, the court found the IRS’s method reasonable and petitioners failed to prove their allocation was more accurate.

On the closing agreement and estoppel issues, the court held that Form 4549 is explicitly not a closing agreement and requires District Director acceptance, which was lacking. Equitable estoppel requires detrimental reliance, which petitioners did not demonstrate, as they merely paid a tax liability.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the timing of loss recognition when casualties and condemnations are intertwined with insurance claims. It reinforces that casualty losses covered by insurance are not “sustained” for tax purposes until the insurance claim’s outcome is reasonably certain. Taxpayers cannot estimate insurance recoveries to claim losses prematurely.

For condemnation cases involving previously casualty-damaged property with pending insurance, the condemnation gain/loss calculation should exclude the basis of the casualty-damaged portion until the insurance claim is resolved. This case highlights the importance of separate accounting for distinct taxable events, even when related to the same property.

Form 4549 (“Income Tax Audit Changes”) is not a closing agreement and does not prevent further IRS adjustments. Taxpayers should be aware that signing and paying based on Form 4549 does not finalize their tax liability. Formal closing agreements (Form 906) are required for finality.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.