Lamphere v. Commissioner, 70 T. C. 391 (1978); 1978 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 108

Actual repair costs, not estimates, can be used to establish the amount of a casualty loss deduction.

Summary

In Lamphere v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed the deductibility of charitable contributions and casualty losses. The court allowed a higher charitable contribution deduction than the IRS had permitted, based on credible testimony. For the casualty loss from Hurricane Agnes, the court permitted a deduction for actual repair costs to a septic system, well, and electrical system but disallowed a deduction for the estimated cost of drilling a new well. The decision emphasized that under IRS regulations, only actual repair costs are acceptable for establishing casualty loss deductions, not estimates, highlighting the importance of documentation in tax cases.

Facts

Claire and Lula Lamphere claimed deductions for charitable contributions in 1970 and a casualty loss due to Hurricane Agnes in 1972. They attended church regularly and made cash contributions but lacked receipts. In 1972, their home was flooded, damaging the garage, driveway, septic system, electrical system, and well. They spent $400 on the septic system, $400 on the well, and $265 on the electrical system. They estimated $1,500 for a new well but could not afford it.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Lampheres' federal income taxes for 1970 and 1972. The Lampheres petitioned the Tax Court, which assigned the case to Special Trial Judge Murray H. Falk. The court adopted Falk's opinion, addressing the charitable contribution and casualty loss deductions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Lampheres are entitled to a charitable contribution deduction for 1970 in excess of the amount allowed by the respondent?
2. Whether the Lampheres are entitled to a casualty loss deduction for 1972, and if so, in what amount?

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found Mrs. Lamphere's testimony credible and allowed a deduction of $100 based on its best judgment.
2. Yes, because the court allowed a deduction of $965 for actual repair costs to the septic system, well, and electrical system; no, because the court disallowed the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

$1,500 estimated cost for drilling a new well, as the IRS regulations require actual repair costs, not estimates.

Court’s Reasoning

The court’s decision on the charitable contribution was based on the Cohan rule, which allows deductions based on the court’s best judgment when specific evidence is lacking. For the casualty loss, the court applied the IRS regulation requiring the use of the cost of repairs method to establish the loss amount. The court found that the Lampheres’ actual expenditures on repairs met the criteria for deductibility, but their estimate for a new well did not, following the precedent set in Farber v. Commissioner that actual repairs and expenditures are necessary.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that taxpayers must document actual repair costs to claim casualty loss deductions, not estimates, which impacts how similar cases should be prepared and litigated. It emphasizes the importance of maintaining detailed records of repair costs following a casualty event. For legal practice, attorneys should advise clients to document all repair expenditures thoroughly. Businesses and homeowners should be aware of the need to complete repairs to claim deductions. Subsequent cases like Turecamo v. Commissioner have continued to apply this ruling, reinforcing the requirement for actual repair costs in casualty loss claims.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.