Piggly Wiggly Southern, Inc. v. Commissioner, 84 T. C. 739 (1985)

Equipment is considered 'placed in service' for depreciation and investment tax credit purposes when it is in a state of readiness and available for a specifically assigned function in an operating trade or business.

Summary

Piggly Wiggly Southern, Inc. sought depreciation and investment tax credits for equipment installed in new, relocated, and remodeled stores. The court held that only the equipment in remodeled stores, which were operational during the fiscal year of purchase, qualified for the credits. Equipment in new and relocated stores, which did not open until the following fiscal year, did not qualify. Additionally, HVAC units installed to meet the environmental needs of refrigeration equipment were classified as tangible personal property, qualifying for investment tax credits for both 1977 and 1979 installations.

Facts

Piggly Wiggly purchased new equipment for its supermarkets during the fiscal years 1977 and 1979. Equipment in remodeled stores was installed and operational during the purchase year, while equipment in new and relocated stores was installed but the stores did not open until the following fiscal year. The company also installed HVAC units to maintain the necessary temperature and humidity for its refrigeration equipment. The IRS disallowed depreciation and investment tax credits for the new and relocated stores' equipment and questioned the classification of the HVAC units as tangible personal property.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency for Piggly Wiggly's fiscal years 1977 and 1979. Piggly Wiggly petitioned the Tax Court, which ruled that equipment in remodeled stores qualified for depreciation and investment tax credits as it was 'placed in service' during the fiscal year of purchase. The court also determined that the HVAC units qualified as tangible personal property under the 'sole justification' test, thus eligible for investment tax credits.

Issue(s)

1. Whether equipment purchased by Piggly Wiggly during fiscal years 1977 and 1979 for use in new, relocated, or remodeled stores was 'placed in service' during those years, qualifying for depreciation and investment tax credits.
2. Whether central heating and air-conditioning units installed by Piggly Wiggly in its stores qualified as 'section 38 property' for investment tax credit purposes.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because equipment in remodeled stores was in use during the fiscal year of purchase, but no for equipment in new and relocated stores as they were not open for business until the following year.
2. Yes, because the HVAC units met the ‘sole justification’ test, being essential for the operation of the refrigeration equipment, and thus constituted tangible personal property.

Court’s Reasoning

The court determined that for equipment to be ‘placed in service,’ it must be in a state of readiness and available for use in an operating business. The court cited regulations and prior cases, noting that equipment in remodeled stores met this criterion as it was operational during the purchase year. For new and relocated stores, the court found that since the stores were not open until the following year, the equipment was not yet in service. Regarding the HVAC units, the court applied the ‘sole justification’ test from the regulations, finding that the units were installed solely to meet the environmental needs of the refrigeration equipment, thus qualifying as tangible personal property. The court rejected the IRS’s argument that the units were installed for customer comfort, emphasizing their essential role in maintaining equipment functionality.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that equipment must be in use within an operating business to qualify for depreciation and investment tax credits. Businesses should carefully time the installation and use of new equipment to align with their fiscal year to maximize tax benefits. The ruling on HVAC units provides guidance on distinguishing between structural components and tangible personal property, particularly in industries where equipment requires specific environmental conditions. This case has influenced subsequent rulings on similar tax credit issues, particularly in retail and manufacturing sectors where equipment readiness and environmental controls are critical.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.