Freeland v. Commissioner, 74 T. C. 970 (1980)

A voluntary reconveyance of property to a nonrecourse mortgagee constitutes a sale for capital loss purposes, even without monetary consideration.

Summary

In Freeland v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that Eugene Freeland's voluntary reconveyance of real property to the mortgagee, secured by a nonrecourse mortgage, was a sale resulting in a capital loss. Freeland had purchased the property for $50,000, paying $9,000 in cash and giving a $41,000 nonrecourse mortgage. When the property's value dropped to $27,000, Freeland reconveyed it to the mortgagee without receiving any monetary consideration. The court held that this transaction was a sale under the Internal Revenue Code, requiring the loss to be treated as capital, not ordinary, despite no personal liability on the mortgage and no monetary consideration received.

Facts

In 1968, Eugene Freeland purchased a 9-acre parcel of unimproved land in California for $50,000, paying $9,000 in cash and securing the remaining $41,000 with a nonrecourse purchase-money mortgage. Under California law, there was no personal liability on this type of mortgage. Freeland held the property as an investment and did not claim any depreciation deductions. By 1975, due to issues with street widening, sewer and water connections, and electrical wire placement, the property's fair market value had decreased to $27,000, while the mortgage balance remained at $41,000. Freeland voluntarily reconveyed the property to the mortgagee via a quitclaim deed without receiving any monetary consideration.

Procedural History

Freeland claimed an ordinary loss of $9,188 on his 1975 federal income tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the loss should be treated as a capital loss and issued a deficiency notice. Freeland petitioned the United States Tax Court, which held that the reconveyance was a sale and thus the loss was capital, not ordinary, ruling in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a voluntary reconveyance of property to a nonrecourse mortgagee, without monetary consideration, constitutes a sale under sections 1211 and 1212 of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. Yes, because the reconveyance was a sale within the meaning of the capital gain and loss provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, resulting in a capital loss subject

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to the limitations of section 1211(b).

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied on the broad interpretation of “sale or exchange” established in Helvering v. Hammel and Crane v. Commissioner, concluding that a voluntary reconveyance of mortgaged property is a sale, even without monetary consideration or personal liability on the mortgage. The court rejected Freeland’s argument that the reconveyance was an abandonment, stating that the transaction effectively terminated his interest in the property and transferred title to the mortgagee. The court also noted that under Crane, the full amount of the nonrecourse mortgage must be included in the amount realized, providing consideration for the sale. The court overruled prior cases that had treated similar reconveyances as abandonments, citing changes in judicial interpretation since those decisions.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that voluntary reconveyances of nonrecourse mortgaged property to the mortgagee are treated as sales for tax purposes, resulting in capital losses rather than ordinary losses. Taxpayers must consider this when planning transactions involving nonrecourse debt, as it affects the tax treatment of any losses. The ruling aligns the tax treatment of voluntary reconveyances with that of foreclosures, preventing taxpayers from choosing between ordinary and capital loss treatment based on the method of disposition. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, and practitioners should advise clients accordingly when dealing with similar transactions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.