Hills v. Commissioner, 74 T. C. 493 (1980)

A taxpayer may claim a theft loss deduction under section 165(a) even if they voluntarily choose not to file an insurance claim for the loss.

Summary

In Hills v. Commissioner, the taxpayers sought a theft loss deduction for a 1976 burglary at their lake house, which they did not report to their insurance due to fears of policy nonrenewal. The Tax Court held that the taxpayers could claim the deduction since the loss was not actually compensated by insurance. The court reasoned that 'compensated' means 'paid' or 'made whole,' and not merely 'covered' by insurance. This decision clarifies that a taxpayer's choice not to file an insurance claim does not preclude a theft loss deduction, impacting how similar future claims should be handled.

Facts

Henry L. Hills and his spouse owned a lake house in Lumpkin County, Georgia, which was insured under an Aetna Homeowners Insurance Policy covering theft and vandalism. On April 1, 1976, Henry discovered a burglary at the house and reported it to the sheriff but did not file a claim with Aetna, fearing it would affect their policy renewal. The Hills had previously filed three claims for burglaries at the same property. They claimed a theft loss deduction of $660 on their 1976 tax return, which included the value of stolen items and related expenses. The IRS disallowed the deduction, asserting that the loss was compensable by insurance.

Procedural History

The Hills filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's disallowance of their theft loss deduction. The court reviewed the case and considered the relevant statutory and regulatory language, as well as prior case law, to determine the deductibility of the loss.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a taxpayer may claim a theft loss deduction under section 165(a) when they voluntarily choose not to file an insurance claim for the loss.

Holding

1. Yes, because the term 'compensated for by insurance' in section 165(a) refers to actual receipt of payment, not merely the availability of insurance coverage.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court analyzed the plain meaning of 'compensated' as used in section

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

165(a), concluding it means ‘to pay’ or ‘to make up for,’ not ‘covered by insurance. ‘ The court noted that the legislative history of the statute supported this interpretation, as it evolved from language allowing deductions for losses ‘not covered by insurance or otherwise, and compensated for’ to the current form focusing solely on compensation. The court further found that IRS regulations also supported this view, emphasizing actual receipt of payment or being made whole. The court distinguished prior cases cited by the IRS, such as Kentucky Utilities Co. v. Glenn, as not directly applicable due to different factual contexts. The court also considered concurring opinions in Axelrod v. Commissioner, which criticized the IRS’s position as lacking statutory support and unfairly disadvantaging taxpayers who fear policy cancellation. The court concluded that the Hills’ decision not to file an insurance claim did not preclude their deduction since the loss was not actually compensated.

Practical Implications

This decision allows taxpayers to claim theft loss deductions even if they choose not to file insurance claims due to concerns about policy renewal or increased premiums. Practitioners should advise clients that the mere availability of insurance does not bar a deduction if no claim is filed. This ruling may influence taxpayers to weigh the benefits of insurance claims against potential policy repercussions more carefully. It also suggests that future cases involving similar circumstances should focus on whether the loss was actually compensated, not just whether insurance was available. The decision could encourage more taxpayers to self-insure or underinsure, particularly in higher tax brackets, as they may prefer the tax deduction over potential insurance complications.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.