Harrigan Lumber Co. , Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 88 T. C. 1562 (1987)

Exclusive hunting rights leased for entertainment purposes are considered a non-deductible entertainment facility under section 274(a)(1)(B).

Summary

Harrigan Lumber Co. leased exclusive hunting rights over a large tract of land to entertain its suppliers and customers, claiming these lease payments as business expenses. The Tax Court held that these payments were not deductible under section 274(a)(1)(B) because the leased hunting area constituted an entertainment facility. The court reasoned that the exclusive and unfettered access to the property for recreational use classified it as a facility, and the payments were an expense related to the facility rather than the activity itself. This decision highlights the distinction between expenses for entertainment activities and those for entertainment facilities, impacting how businesses can claim deductions for such expenses.

Facts

Harrigan Lumber Co. leased exclusive hunting rights to approximately 6,098 acres in Monroe County, Alabama, for 10 years starting March 1, 1979. The company used this land to entertain its suppliers and customers, hosting hunting and fishing events. During the taxable years 1980 and 1981, Harrigan claimed deductions for the lease payments made to R. B. Williams Co. , Inc. , for these hunting rights. The company operated a hunting lodge on a separate 10-acre tract and used the larger leased area for hunting and fishing activities, which were exclusively for Harrigan's use except for limited access by the lessor's family members.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Harrigan's deductions for the hunting rights lease payments. Harrigan filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court, which heard the case on stipulated facts. The Tax Court issued its decision on June 23, 1987, affirming the Commissioner's disallowance of the deductions under section 274(a)(1)(B).

Issue(s)

1. Whether the leased hunting area constitutes an entertainment facility under section 274(a)(1)(B).
2. Whether the lease payments for the hunting rights are an item with respect to a facility used in connection with entertainment under section 274(a)(1)(B).

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because Harrigan had exclusive use and unfettered access to the hunting area for entertainment purposes, the hunting area is a facility within the meaning of section 274(a)(1)(B).
2. Yes, because the lease payments are for the continuing enjoyment of the property, they relate more to the facility than to the recreational activity and are an item with respect to a facility under section 274(a)(1)(B), and therefore are not deductible.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied section 274(a)(1)(B), which disallows deductions for items related to entertainment facilities. It determined that the leased hunting area was a facility because Harrigan had exclusive occupancy of the land during its recreational use. The court distinguished between expenses for entertainment activities and those for entertainment facilities, noting that the former might be deductible if they meet certain criteria, while the latter are strictly disallowed. The court rejected Harrigan's argument that the hunting rights were intangible property separate from the land, emphasizing that the payments were for the use of the property itself. The court also considered the legislative history of section 274 and its regulations, which include examples of facilities like hunting lodges. Judge Swift concurred but proposed a different test based on long-term rights integral to facility use, while Judge Jacobs concurred but expressed concern over adopting an exclusivity test without further consideration.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that exclusive long-term leases for recreational activities, such as hunting rights, are considered entertainment facilities under section 274(a)(1)(B), making related expenses non-deductible. Businesses must carefully assess whether their expenditures are for activities or facilities, as this impacts their ability to claim deductions. The ruling affects how companies structure entertainment expenses for clients and suppliers, potentially requiring them to use public or commercial facilities to claim deductions. Subsequent cases like this have reinforced the strict interpretation of section 274(a)(1)(B), influencing how businesses plan entertainment-related expenses and how tax professionals advise their clients on such matters.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.