***Noble v. Commissioner, 70 T. C. 916 (1978)***

Sewer tap fees paid for connection to a municipal sewer system are capital expenditures, not deductible as taxes or business expenses, but amortizable over the useful life of the sewer system.

**Summary**

In Noble v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that a sewer tap fee paid by a property owner to connect to a municipal sewer system is a capital expenditure rather than a deductible tax or business expense. The fee, which was required by a city ordinance and used to expand the sewer system, was determined to be a special assessment that benefited the property. The court held that the fee could not be deducted as a tax under section 164(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code, nor as a business expense under sections 162 and 212, but could be amortized over the 50-year useful life of the sewer system, reflecting the duration of the benefit conferred to the property.

**Facts**

Glenn A. Noble owned and operated a motel, a market, and a restaurant in Brentwood, Tennessee. Prior to 1973, he used a private sewage treatment plant for these properties. In 1973, Brentwood enacted an ordinance requiring property owners to connect to its new sewer system and pay a one-time “tap fee” based on estimated usage, along with monthly service charges. Noble paid a negotiated $6,000 tap fee for his properties, which he attempted to deduct as a business expense on his tax return.

**Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Noble’s 1973 income tax and disallowed the deduction of the tap fee. Noble petitioned the United States Tax Court, which heard the case and ruled on the tax treatment of the sewer tap fee.

**Issue(s)**

1. Whether the sewer tap fee paid to Brentwood is a nondeductible tax for local improvements under section 164(c)(1)?
2. Whether the sewer tap fee is an ordinary and necessary business expense under sections 162 and 212, or a capital expenditure?
3. Whether the sewer tap fee can be depreciated under section 167?

**Holding**

1. No, because the sewer tap fee is a special assessment that benefits the property assessed and is not deductible as a tax under section 164(c)(1).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

2. No, because the sewer tap fee is a capital expenditure that provides long-term benefits to the property, not an ordinary and necessary business expense under sections 162 and 212.
3. Yes, because the sewer tap fee can be amortized over the useful life of the sewer system, which the court determined to be 50 years.

**Court’s Reasoning**

The court applied the statutory definition of “Taxes assessed against local benefits” as special assessments under section 164(c)(1), which are nondeductible unless allocated to maintenance or interest charges. The sewer tap fee was deemed a special assessment because it was directly related to the benefit provided to Noble’s property by the sewer system. The court rejected the deduction as an ordinary business expense because the fee represented a capital improvement to the land with a duration exceeding one year. The court allowed amortization of the fee over the 50-year useful life of the sewer system, citing the principle that intangible rights can have a life coextensive with the related tangible asset. The court referenced Revenue Procedure 72-10 to estimate the sewer system’s useful life, choosing the 50-year guideline for water utilities.

**Practical Implications**

This decision clarifies that sewer tap fees are capital expenditures rather than deductible taxes or business expenses, affecting how property owners should account for such fees on their tax returns. Property owners must amortize these fees over the useful life of the sewer system rather than deduct them immediately. This ruling impacts municipal finance strategies, as it reinforces the treatment of tap fees as capital contributions rather than operating revenues. Subsequent cases and IRS guidance may further refine the amortization period based on the specific characteristics of different sewer systems. Legal practitioners advising clients on real estate and tax matters should consider this precedent when planning for the tax treatment of similar municipal assessments.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 