Randolph Building Corporation v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 67 T. C. 804 (1977)

Future demolition costs cannot be used to adjust the allocation of a purchase price between land and building for depreciation purposes.

Summary

In this case, the Tax Court held that the Randolph Building Corporation could not allocate its purchase price of a commercial property between land and building by considering the present value of future demolition costs. The court emphasized that depreciation basis must reflect the relative market values of the land and building at the time of acquisition. The court rejected the taxpayer's method as it would lead to an improper double deduction and distort the allocation based on current values. This decision clarifies how depreciation must be calculated for properties where future demolition is anticipated but not imminent.

Facts

Randolph Building Corporation purchased a commercial property in Chicago's loop area in 1967 for $1,918,000, which included a multifunctional building known as the Oriental Theatre Building or Civic Tower. The building, built in 1926, had a remaining useful life of 20 years. After acquisition, the corporation made significant renovations costing over $1. 9 million. The parties disputed how to allocate the purchase price between the land and building for depreciation purposes, with the taxpayer arguing that the value of the land should be reduced by the present value of estimated future demolition costs.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Randolph Building Corporation's federal income taxes for the fiscal years ending August 31, 1968, 1969, 1970, and 1971, due to disagreements on the amount of depreciation deductible. The case was brought before the United States Tax Court, where the sole issue was the proper allocation of the purchase price for depreciation purposes.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the value of the land should be decreased, and the value of the building correspondingly increased, by the present value of estimated future demolition costs when allocating the purchase price for depreciation purposes?

Holding

1. No, because future demolition costs should not be used to adjust the allocation of the purchase price between land and building for depreciation purposes. The court found that such an adjustment would not reflect current market values and could

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

lead to a double deduction.

Court’s Reasoning

The court rejected the taxpayer’s argument that the allocation of the purchase price should be adjusted for future demolition costs. The court noted that depreciation must be based on the relative market values of the land and building at the time of acquisition, not on hypothetical future costs. The court explained that even if future demolition costs were relevant, they should reduce the value of the building, not the land. The court highlighted that considering such costs would lead to absurd results, such as increasing the building’s value as it ages and allowing a double deduction for demolition costs. The court also noted that the property’s renovations and marketing indicated an intent to continue using the building, not demolish it. The court ultimately allocated $1,582,000 to the land and $588,000 to the building, based on current market values.

Practical Implications

This decision affects how taxpayers should calculate depreciation for properties where future demolition is anticipated. It clarifies that depreciation allocations must be based on current market values at the time of acquisition, not on future costs. Taxpayers cannot adjust the allocation to account for future demolition costs, even if such costs are expected. This ruling prevents a double deduction for demolition costs and ensures that depreciation reflects the current economic reality of the property. Practitioners should be cautious in how they allocate purchase prices and may need to adjust their calculations to comply with this decision. Subsequent cases have reinforced this principle, emphasizing that depreciation is tied to the property’s current state and intended use.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.