Gibson & Associates, Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 136 T. C. 195 (2011) (United States Tax Court, 2011)

Gibson & Associates, Inc. , an engineering and heavy construction company, sought a domestic production activities deduction under IRC Section 199 for its work on infrastructure projects. The court ruled that the company's receipts qualified as domestic production gross receipts (DPGR) to the extent they erected or substantially renovated real property, reversing the IRS's determination. This decision clarified the criteria for substantial renovation, impacting how construction businesses qualify for tax deductions under Section 199.

Parties

Gibson & Associates, Inc. (Petitioner) was the plaintiff at trial and on appeal, seeking a deduction under IRC Section 199. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) was the defendant at trial and on appeal, challenging the deduction claimed by Gibson & Associates, Inc.

Facts

Gibson & Associates, Inc. , a family-owned corporation based in Texas, specializes in engineering and heavy highway construction, focusing on streets, bridges, airport runways, and other infrastructure across Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas. For its fiscal year ending June 30, 2006, the company reported $26,053,570 in domestic production gross receipts (DPGR) and claimed a $63,435 deduction under IRC Section 199. The IRS issued a notice of deficiency asserting that none of Gibson's receipts qualified as DPGR, leading to a $21,568 tax deficiency. Gibson contested this, arguing its work constituted the erection or substantial renovation of real property. The parties later conceded on certain projects, narrowing the dispute to whether $11,945,168 of the reported DPGR qualified under Section 199.

Procedural History

Gibson & Associates, Inc. petitioned the United States Tax Court to redetermine the IRS's deficiency determination. The IRS conceded that $13,849,246 of Gibson's reported DPGR qualified under Section 199, and Gibson conceded that $259,156 of the reported amount was incorrectly classified as DPGR. The court proceeded to determine the status of the remaining disputed amount, applying a de novo standard of review.

Issue(s)

Whether Gibson & Associates, Inc. 's gross receipts from the disputed projects qualify as domestic production gross receipts (DPGR) under IRC Section 199(c)(4)(A)(ii), specifically whether the work performed constituted the construction of real property through erection or substantial renovation?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

IRC Section 199(c)(4)(A)(ii) defines DPGR to include gross receipts from the construction of real property performed in the United States by a taxpayer engaged in the active conduct of a construction trade or business. Treasury Regulation Section 1. 199-3(m)(5) defines "substantial renovation" as the renovation of a major component or substantial structural part of real property that materially increases the value of the property, substantially prolongs its useful life, or adapts it to a new or different use.

Holding

The court held that Gibson & Associates, Inc. 's gross receipts from the disputed projects qualified as DPGR under IRC Section 199 to the extent the company erected or substantially renovated real property. The court found that the work performed by Gibson met the criteria for substantial renovation, materially increasing the value of the property, substantially prolonging its useful life, or adapting it to a new or different use.

Reasoning

The court's decision was based on a detailed analysis of the projects undertaken by Gibson & Associates, Inc. The court applied the legal test for substantial renovation as defined in the regulations, examining whether the work materially increased the value of the property, substantially prolonged its useful life, or adapted it to a new or different use. The court relied on expert testimony from Gibson's engineers, who provided detailed accounts of the work performed and its impact on the infrastructure. The court rejected the IRS's argument that the work was merely routine maintenance, finding that Gibson's projects significantly enhanced the longevity, utility, and worth of the infrastructure. The court also considered policy implications, noting that the ruling aligned with the legislative intent of Section 199 to promote domestic production and job creation.

Disposition

The court's decision was entered under Rule 155, instructing the parties to compute the amount of the allowable deduction based on the court's findings and conclusions.

Significance/Impact

This case clarified the application of IRC Section 199 to construction activities, particularly regarding what constitutes substantial renovation of real property. It established that significant rehabilitation work on infrastructure, even when not involving the entire structure, can qualify for the domestic production activities deduction. The decision impacted how construction businesses assess their eligibility for tax deductions under Section 199 and influenced subsequent IRS

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

guidance and court decisions on similar issues.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.