Hodgdon v. Commissioner, 98 T. C. 424 (1992)

A charitable contribution deduction is considered 'allowable' under the bargain sale rules even if the deduction is carried over to subsequent years and never actually used.

Summary

In Hodgdon v. Commissioner, the Tax Court held that a charitable contribution to Campus Crusade for Christ, treated as a bargain sale due to outstanding indebtedness, resulted in an 'allowable' deduction under Section 1011(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court rejected the taxpayers' argument that the earlier contribution to the City of San Bernardino should be fully deducted before considering the Campus Crusade contribution. The ruling clarified that contributions of capital gain property made in the same tax year are treated as part of a homogenous pool, not subject to a 'first-in, first-out' rule. This decision upheld the validity of Treasury Regulation Section 1. 1011-2(a)(2), which deems a deduction 'allowable' if it can be carried over to future years, regardless of whether it is eventually used.

Facts

Warner W. Hodgdon and Sharon D. Hodgdon donated a parcel of land to the City of San Bernardino on May 7, 1980, valued at $800,000 for charitable deduction purposes. On December 22, 1980, they donated another property to Campus Crusade for Christ, valued at $3,932,360 but subject to outstanding liabilities of $2,624,103. The latter donation was treated as a bargain sale under the tax code. The total allowable deductions for capital gain property contributions in 1980 and 1981 were $447,443 and $20,963, respectively, which did not cover the full value of either donation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies in the Hodgdon's income taxes for the years 1980-1983, leading to the taxpayers filing a petition with the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court considered whether the bargain sale rule under Section 1011(b) applied to the Campus Crusade contribution, ultimately ruling in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the charitable contribution to Campus Crusade for Christ resulted in an 'allowable' deduction under Section 1011(b), despite the full deduction not being used in the year of contribution or any subsequent carryover years.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the contribution was part of a pool of contributions from which deductions were taken, and Section 1011(b) does not impose a ‘first-in, first-out’ rule for deductions within a single tax year.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the statutory language of Section 170 and Section 1011(b) did not support a ‘first-in, first-out’ rule for contributions made within the same tax year. The court emphasized that the contributions of the San Bernardino and Campus Crusade properties formed a homogenous pool, from which the total allowable deductions were drawn. The court also upheld the validity of Treasury Regulation Section 1. 1011-2(a)(2), which considers a deduction ‘allowable’ if it can be carried over, regardless of whether it is eventually used. The court noted the potential impact of statutes of limitations on the rights of taxpayers and the government, suggesting that a literal interpretation of ‘allowable’ could lead to unfair outcomes. The court deferred to the Treasury’s interpretation, given the long-standing nature of the regulation and the absence of contrary legislative action.

Practical Implications

This decision affects how taxpayers and tax practitioners should approach charitable contributions of capital gain property subject to outstanding liabilities. It clarifies that such contributions are subject to the bargain sale rules under Section 1011(b), even if the full deduction is not used in the year of contribution or any carryover year. Taxpayers must recognize gain on the sale portion of the property, regardless of whether the charitable deduction is ultimately used. This ruling also reinforces the importance of Treasury Regulations in interpreting tax statutes, particularly where the language is ambiguous or subject to multiple interpretations. Subsequent cases have relied on this decision when addressing similar issues of charitable contributions and bargain sales.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.