Olson v. Commissioner, 86 T. C. 350 (1986)

Only inexhaustible energy sources qualify as ‘renewable energy sources’ for residential energy credit under section 44C.

Summary

In Olson v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that expenditures for a wood burning stove did not qualify for the residential energy credit under section 44C of the Internal Revenue Code. The court upheld the IRS regulation that limits ‘renewable energy source’ to inexhaustible sources like solar, wind, and geothermal energy, explicitly excluding wood. The petitioners, Theodore and Rainsford Olson, argued that wood should be considered renewable, but the court found the regulation to be a reasonable exercise of the Secretary’s authority and consistent with the statute’s intent to promote inexhaustible energy sources.

Facts

Theodore and Rainsford Olson claimed a $238. 95 energy credit on their 1979 federal income tax return for expenditures related to a wood burning stove installed in their home. These expenditures included the stove itself, a heat shield, delivery, and stove pipe, totaling $796. 50. The IRS disallowed the credit, asserting that a wood stove does not constitute ‘renewable energy source property’ under section 44C.

Procedural History

The Olsons filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS’s disallowance of their energy credit. The case was submitted on a fully stipulated record, and the court considered the legal issue of whether the expenditures qualified for the credit under the relevant statute and regulations.

Issue(s)

1. Whether expenditures for a wood burning stove qualify as ‘qualified renewable energy source expenditures’ under section 44C of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the regulation limiting ‘renewable energy sources’ to inexhaustible sources is a reasonable and valid exercise of the Secretary’s authority, and wood is not considered an inexhaustible energy source.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the legislative regulation under section 1. 44C-6(c)(2)(i), which specifies that only inexhaustible energy sources qualify as ‘renewable energy

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

sources’. The court noted that the statute explicitly lists solar, wind, and geothermal energy, all inexhaustible sources, and delegates to the Secretary the authority to add other renewable sources. The regulation’s exclusion of wood was deemed reasonable and consistent with the legislative intent to promote inexhaustible energy sources. The court emphasized that wood, despite being renewable in a broader sense, is not inexhaustible and thus does not meet the criteria set by the regulation. Furthermore, the court pointed out that the legislative history and subsequent congressional actions supported the Secretary’s discretion in defining qualifying energy sources. The court also referenced the early stage of technology for solar, wind, and geothermal equipment at the time of the statute’s enactment, contrasting it with the long-standing use of wood stoves, which Congress did not intend to encourage through the credit.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for residential energy credits under section 44C, only inexhaustible energy sources qualify as ‘renewable’. Taxpayers and practitioners must adhere to the IRS’s strict interpretation of what constitutes a ‘renewable energy source’. This ruling impacts how similar cases involving other energy sources are analyzed, emphasizing the need to verify whether the energy source is inexhaustible. It also affects legal practice by reinforcing the deference courts give to legislative regulations. Businesses and homeowners considering alternative energy solutions must consider this ruling when planning installations and seeking tax credits. Subsequent cases have continued to uphold this narrow interpretation of ‘renewable energy source’, affecting the eligibility of various energy technologies for tax incentives.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.