Fasken v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 650 (1979)

When selling easements over part of a larger property, the consideration received must be applied against the basis allocable to the specific portion of the property covered by the easements.

Summary

In Fasken v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that when David and Barbara Fasken granted four easements over their large Texas ranch, the proceeds should be applied against the basis of the specific land covered by the easements, not the entire ranch. The Faskens argued that the easements diminished the ranch's overall value, but the court found that the easements did not significantly affect the ranch's use for grazing. The court's decision emphasized that when part of a larger property is sold, the basis must be equitably apportioned to the part sold, unless such allocation is impossible or impracticable.

Facts

David Fasken and the Estate of Inez G. Fasken owned a 165,229. 85-acre ranch in Texas used primarily for cattle grazing. In 1974, they granted four easements to various companies: two for pipelines, one for a microwave tower, and one for a cathodic protection unit. The easements covered a total of approximately 33 acres. The Faskens received $18,486. 50 in consideration for these easements but did not report this as income, arguing that the easements diminished the value of the entire ranch.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Faskens' 1974 income taxes, asserting that the easement proceeds should be treated as capital gains. The Faskens petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to challenge these determinations. The Tax Court held that the proceeds should be applied against the basis of the land covered by the easements, not the entire ranch, and upheld the Commissioner's position, with a minor adjustment to the allocation of basis for two of the easements.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the consideration received for granting easements should be applied against the basis of the entire ranch or only the portion of the ranch covered by the easements.

Holding

1. No, because the court found that the easements did not materially affect the use of the ranch as a whole, and a rational allocation of the basis to the easement areas was possible and appropriate.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the principle from Treasury Regulation § 1. 61-6(a), which states that when a part of a larger property is sold, the cost or other basis must be equitably apportioned among the parts sold. The Faskens argued that the easements affected the entire ranch’s value, particularly its grazing capacity and potential for subdivision. However, the court found that the easements did not significantly diminish the ranch’s overall utility for grazing, as evidenced by continued leasing of the same acreage before and after the easements were granted. The court noted that the easements were well-defined and did not render substantial additional land unusable. The court distinguished cases where allocation was deemed impracticable, finding that in this case, a rational allocation was possible. The court quoted the regulation, emphasizing that each sale of a part of the property must be treated as a separate transaction with gain or loss computed separately.

Practical Implications

This decision establishes that when granting easements over part of a larger property, taxpayers must allocate a portion of the property’s basis to the easement areas for tax purposes. This ruling impacts how similar transactions should be analyzed, requiring a careful apportionment of basis to avoid overstatement of gains. For legal practitioners, it underscores the need to assess the specific impact of easements on the property and to document any diminution in value of the remaining property. The decision may also influence how landowners negotiate easement agreements, considering the tax implications of allocating basis. Subsequent cases have followed this principle, reinforcing the need for precise allocation when selling parts of larger properties.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.