T.C. Memo. 1943-411

Fines and court costs paid as a result of operating an illegal business are not deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under federal tax law.

Summary

The petitioners, partners in a gambling business, sought to deduct fines and court costs incurred due to repeated raids on their establishments as ordinary and necessary business expenses. The Tax Court denied the deduction, holding that allowing such a deduction would be against public policy by effectively subsidizing illegal activities. The court distinguished the case from situations where legal businesses incurred expenses defending against accusations of wrongdoing, emphasizing that the petitioners' business itself was unlawful.

Facts

Petitioners were partners operating gambling establishments in Wheeling, West Virginia. They knowingly conducted an unlawful business under city ordinances. The partners anticipated that their establishments would be raided regularly and factored the expected fines and court costs into their business calculations as necessary expenses.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction claimed by the petitioners for the fines and court costs paid during the 1940 tax year. The petitioners then appealed to the Tax Court of the United States.

Issue(s)

Whether fines and court costs paid by partners operating an illegal gambling business are deductible as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses under Section 23(a) of the Revenue Act of 1938.

Holding

No, because allowing the deduction of expenses directly related to the operation of an illegal business would be contrary to public policy.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that while income derived from an illegal business is taxable, it does not automatically follow that all expenses related to that business are deductible. The court distinguished the case from *Heininger v. Commissioner*, where a taxpayer was allowed to deduct legal fees incurred in defending a lawful business against a fraud order. In *Heininger*, the business itself was legal, whereas, in the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

present case, the petitioners were knowingly operating an illegal enterprise. The court emphasized that “It is clearly not the policy of the law to countenance the conduct of an illegal business.” Allowing the deduction of fines would, in effect, subsidize illegal activities, which is against public policy. The court cited *Great Northern Railway Co. v. Commissioner*, stating that Congress did not intend to give carriers “the advantage, directly or indirectly, of any reduction, directly or indirectly, of these penalties.”

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that expenses directly resulting from the operation of an illegal business are generally not deductible for tax purposes, even if those expenses are predictable and considered necessary by the operators. The critical distinction lies in the legality of the underlying business activity. While the IRS taxes income from illegal sources, it generally disallows deductions for costs that are intrinsic to the illegal activity itself. This ruling deters illegal activities by preventing them from receiving an indirect subsidy through tax deductions. It reinforces the principle that tax law should not facilitate or encourage illegal conduct. Subsequent cases have applied this principle to deny deductions for bribes, kickbacks, and other expenses directly related to unlawful activities. However, businesses facing legal challenges should still consult with tax professionals, as expenses incurred while defending a legitimate business may be deductible, even if the business is ultimately found to be in violation of certain regulations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.