Daily v. Commissioner, 81 T. C. 161 (1983)

Abandonment loss is not deductible until a closed and completed transaction occurs, particularly when the property is subject to a contract with enforceable obligations.

Summary

In Daily v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court held that a partnership could not claim an abandonment loss on an apartment building in 1976 because the transaction was not closed and completed until 1977 when the sellers declared a forfeiture. The partnership had ceased payments and attempted to abandon the property, but the sellers retained the right to enforce the contract through specific performance. The court emphasized that for a loss to be deductible, the property must be discarded irrevocably or permanently, which was not possible while the sellers could still enforce the contract.

Facts

In 1974, a partnership purchased three apartment buildings under a land sales contract, with the sellers retaining title until full payment. By 1976, the partnership determined that one building (5th Avenue property) was not profitable. The partnership evicted tenants, shut off utilities, terminated insurance, stopped maintenance, and ceased payments on the contract. Despite these actions, the sellers rejected the partnership's attempt to forfeit the property in December 1976. In March 1977, the sellers declared a forfeiture, which became effective 10 days later.

Procedural History

The partnership claimed an abandonment loss for the 5th Avenue property on its 1976 tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction, leading to a deficiency notice. The case proceeded to the U. S. Tax Court, where the partnership argued for the deductibility of the loss in 1976, while the Commissioner argued that any loss should be recognized in 1977 when the forfeiture occurred.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the partnership sustained a deductible abandonment loss on the 5th Avenue property in 1976.

Holding

1. No, because the partnership could not irrevocably discard the property in 1976 due to the sellers' right to enforce the contract through specific performance, and thus, no closed and completed transaction occurred until the 1977 forfeiture.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. | 1

The Tax Court relied on the principle that abandonment loss is only deductible upon a closed and completed transaction. The court noted that under the contract, the sellers had the right to enforce specific performance, meaning the partnership could not discard the property irrevocably in 1976. The court distinguished this case from Middleton v. Commissioner, which involved nonrecourse debt, by emphasizing that the possibility of specific performance meant the partnership could be forced to reacquire the property, negating any claim of permanent abandonment. The court cited Treasury Regulations requiring the taxpayer's intent to discard the asset irrevocably or permanently for loss recognition. The court concluded that the transaction was not closed until the 1977 forfeiture, and thus, no deduction was allowable in 1976.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for tax purposes, abandonment loss cannot be claimed until the transaction is closed and completed, especially when the property is subject to a contract with enforceable obligations. Practitioners must carefully assess whether a taxpayer's actions constitute a final and irrevocable abandonment, considering any rights retained by other parties that could force continued involvement with the property. This ruling impacts how taxpayers and their advisors approach the timing of abandonment loss deductions, particularly in real estate transactions involving land sales contracts. Subsequent cases involving similar issues would need to consider the enforceability of contractual obligations when determining the deductibility of abandonment losses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.