Meyers v. Commissioner, 65 T. C. 258 (1975)

Topsoil removed and sold with sod qualifies as a “natural deposit” eligible for a depletion deduction under IRC section 611.

Summary

John W. Meyers, Jr. , a sod producer, claimed a depletion deduction for topsoil removed during sod harvesting. The IRS denied the deduction, arguing sod production was akin to farming and ineligible for depletion. The Tax Court held that sod, including its topsoil, is a “natural deposit” subject to depletion under IRC section 611. The court distinguished sod production from farming, noting that after 16 cuttings, the topsoil would be exhausted, justifying a depletion allowance to recover the diminishing capital investment in the land.

Facts

John W. Meyers, Jr. , and his wife Loma M. Meyers filed joint federal income tax returns for 1970 and 1971. Meyers was engaged in sod production and farming, using both owned and leased land. The process of growing and harvesting sod involved seeding, fertilization, watering, mowing, rolling, and spraying for insect control over two years. Each sod cutting removed some topsoil, and after 16 cuttings, the available topsoil would be exhausted. Meyers claimed a depletion deduction for the topsoil removed during sod harvesting, which the IRS disallowed, asserting that sod production was similar to farming and not eligible for depletion.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in Meyers’ federal income tax for 1970 and 1971, disallowing the claimed depletion deductions for topsoil removed with sod. Meyers petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court, after reviewing the case, held that the topsoil removed with sod qualified as a “natural deposit” eligible for a depletion deduction under IRC section 611.

Issue(s)

1. Whether topsoil removed and sold with sod qualifies as a “natural deposit” under IRC section 611, entitling the taxpayer to a depletion deduction.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found that sod, including its topsoil, is a “natural deposit” subject to depletion under IRC section 611, distinguishing it from typical farming activities where depletion is not allowed.

Court’s Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court’s decision was based on the interpretation of IRC section 611, which allows a depletion deduction for “natural deposits. ” The court rejected the IRS’s argument that sod production was akin to farming, where depletion is not allowed. Instead, it emphasized that sod is defined as a combination of soil and plant life, and the removal of topsoil with sod leads to its eventual exhaustion after 16 cuttings. This exhaustion justified a depletion allowance to recover the taxpayer’s diminishing capital investment in the land. The court relied on previous cases like United States v. Shurbet and Fiona Corp. v. United States, which supported the allowance of depletion for natural resources that are exhaustible. The court also distinguished this case from Revenue Ruling 54-241, which denied depletion for sod producers, noting that in Meyers’ situation, restoring the land after topsoil exhaustion was not economically feasible.

Practical Implications

This decision allows sod producers to claim a depletion deduction for topsoil removed with sod, treating it as a “natural deposit” under IRC section 611. Legal practitioners should advise clients in the sod industry to consider claiming such deductions, as it can significantly impact their tax liabilities. The ruling distinguishes sod production from traditional farming, where depletion deductions are not allowed, and may influence how similar cases involving the depletion of natural resources are analyzed. Businesses in this sector may need to adjust their accounting practices to account for depletion. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling, affirming the eligibility of sod-related topsoil for depletion deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.