Estate of Walter F. Klosterman, Deceased, Kent Klosterman and Alan Klosterman, Personal Representatives, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 99 T. C. 313 (1992)

Operation and maintenance charges assessed by irrigation districts must be included in the gross cash rental for farmland valuation under Section 2032A, and are not deductible as State and local real estate taxes.

Summary

The Estate of Klosterman sought to value farmland under Section 2032A, which allows for valuation based on farming use rather than highest and best use. The central issue was whether operation and maintenance (O&M) charges from irrigation districts should be included in the gross cash rental and if they were deductible as State and local taxes. The Tax Court held that these charges must be included in the gross cash rental as they represent part of the payment for land use, and they are not deductible as taxes under Section 164 because they are assessed against local benefits that tend to increase property value.

Facts

Walter F. Klosterman owned 369 acres of farmland in Idaho, situated within the Minidoka and A&B Irrigation Districts. These districts, political subdivisions of Idaho, assessed annual operation and maintenance (O&M) charges on all irrigable land within their boundaries. Landowners included these charges in the cash rent charged to tenants. The estate elected to value the farmland under Section 2032A, which requires valuation based on the average annual gross cash rental minus average annual State and local real estate taxes, capitalized by the Federal Land Bank interest rate.

Procedural History

The estate filed a tax return electing to value the farmland under Section 2032A. The Commissioner determined a deficiency, arguing that O&M charges should be included in gross cash rental and not deducted as taxes. The case was submitted to the United States Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the operation and maintenance charges assessed by the irrigation districts must be included in the "average annual gross cash rental" for farmland valuation under Section 2032A?
2. Whether these charges can be subtracted from the "average annual gross cash rental" as "State and local real estate taxes"?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the plain language of Section 2032A and the applicable regulation indicate that “gross” cash rental includes all cash received for land use, including O&M charges, without deduction for any expenses other than State and local real estate taxes.
2. No, because these charges are assessed against local benefits and tend to increase the value of the assessed property, and thus are not deductible under Section 164.

Court’s Reasoning

The court interpreted the “gross” cash rental requirement under Section 2032A(e)(7)(A) to include all cash received, including O&M charges, as supported by Section 20. 2032A-4(b)(1) of the Estate Tax Regulations. The court rejected the estate’s argument that these charges were for water rather than land use, noting that landowners included these charges in the rent and tenants had no option to rent without compensating for these charges. The court also held that O&M charges were not deductible as taxes under Section 164 because they were assessed against local benefits that increased property value, and the estate failed to prove any portion allocable to maintenance or interest charges. The court’s decision aligned with the legislative intent to value farmland based on its use for farming, not its highest and best use, and upheld the validity of the applicable regulation.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for farmland valuation under Section 2032A, all charges included in cash rent, including irrigation district O&M charges, must be considered part of the gross cash rental. Estates valuing farmland under this section cannot deduct such charges as State and local taxes unless they can prove the charges are allocable to maintenance or interest. This ruling impacts how estates calculate the value of farmland for tax purposes, potentially increasing the tax burden on estates with farmland subject to such charges. Subsequent cases and practitioners should carefully analyze the nature of any charges included in cash rent to ensure accurate valuation under Section 2032A. This case also reaffirms the importance of understanding the distinction between taxes and other charges in estate tax planning.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.