Mandler v. Commissioner, 65 T. C. 586 (1975)

Coin-operated laundry equipment in apartment buildings and trailer parks qualifies for the investment credit if available to the public on the same basis as to tenants.

Summary

In Mandler v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that coin-operated washers and dryers installed in apartment buildings and trailer parks were eligible for the investment credit under section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code. The equipment was owned and operated by Wesrod Washer Services, Inc. , a subchapter S corporation, and was available to both tenants and the public. The court held that such equipment qualified as "nonlodging commercial facilities," thus falling within an exception to the rule that property used for lodging is not eligible for the investment credit. The decision also affirmed the petitioners' entitlement to investment credit carryovers from previous years, highlighting the importance of equitable tax treatment for similar commercial operations.

Facts

The petitioners, Sydney and Elaine S. Mandler and Sandor and Elaine R. Spector, were shareholders in Wesrod Washer Services, Inc. , a subchapter S corporation that operated coin-activated laundry facilities in apartment buildings and trailer parks. These facilities were available to both tenants and the general public. Wesrod retained ownership of the machines, which had a useful life of about 8 years. The petitioners claimed investment credits for the years 1966, 1967, and 1968, which were disallowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the grounds that the equipment did not constitute "section 38 property" eligible for the investment credit.

Procedural History

The petitioners filed joint tax returns for the years 1966, 1967, and 1968 and sought the investment credit for their share of Wesrod's investments in laundry equipment. The Commissioner determined deficiencies in the petitioners' federal income tax and disallowed the investment credits claimed. The petitioners then challenged these determinations before the United States Tax Court, which heard the case and issued its decision on December 18, 1975.

Issue(s)

1. Whether coin-operated laundry equipment, leased for use in apartment buildings and trailer parks, is eligible for the investment credit under section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the petitioners are entitled to investment credit carryovers from 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965 to 1966, 1967, and 1968.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the coin-operated laundry equipment qualified as “nonlodging commercial facilities” available to the public on the same basis as to tenants, thus falling within an exception to the rule that property used for lodging is not eligible for the investment credit.
2. Yes, because the petitioners proved they had unused investment credits from prior years that could be carried over to the years in issue.

Court’s Reasoning

The court’s decision focused on the interpretation of section 48(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, which excludes property used predominantly for lodging from the investment credit. However, the court found that the coin-operated laundry facilities qualified as “nonlodging commercial facilities” under section 48(a)(3)(A), which allows for an exception if the facilities are available to the public on the same basis as to tenants. The court emphasized the legislative intent to place nonlodging commercial facilities on an equal competitive footing with similar facilities located elsewhere. The court also noted the lack of distinction between vending machines and laundry machines in the regulations, further supporting its conclusion. Additionally, the court considered the subsequent amendment to the law in 1971, which explicitly included coin-operated laundry machines as eligible for the investment credit, but did not draw inferences from this amendment regarding the prior law. The court also upheld the petitioners’ entitlement to investment credit carryovers, as they had proven the existence of unused credits from prior years.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for businesses operating coin-operated laundry facilities in residential settings. It clarifies that such equipment is eligible for the investment credit, provided it is available to the public on the same terms as to tenants. This ruling levels the playing field for commercial operations competing with standalone laundromats. Legal practitioners should consider this case when advising clients on tax planning strategies involving investment in commercial equipment within residential properties. The decision also reinforces the importance of carryover provisions in the tax code, ensuring that taxpayers can benefit from unused credits in subsequent years. Subsequent cases and legislative amendments have built upon this ruling, further refining the scope of the investment credit for commercial facilities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.