6 T.C. 323 (1946)

Expenses for childcare to enable a parent to work are considered personal expenses and are generally not deductible as business expenses under federal income tax law.

Summary

Mildred O’Connor, a school teacher, sought to deduct the cost of a nursemaid she employed to care for her two young children, arguing the expense was necessary for her to maintain her employment. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction, holding that childcare expenses are personal in nature, even when incurred to enable a parent to work and earn income. The court relied on established precedent that distinguished between business expenses and non-deductible personal expenses.

Facts

Mildred O’Connor was employed as a teacher in New York City public schools. She had two children, ages 1 and 2. To enable her to work, O’Connor employed a nursemaid to care for her children and assist with some housekeeping duties. O’Connor paid the nursemaid $600 in salary, plus room and board valued at $400, for a total of $1,000. On her 1941 tax return, O’Connor claimed a $1,000 deduction for the nursemaid’s expenses.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed O’Connor’s deduction. O’Connor then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether the expenses incurred by a working mother for the care of her children are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses or as non-trade or non-business expenses incurred for the production or collection of income.

Holding

No, because childcare expenses are considered personal expenses, and personal expenses are explicitly non-deductible under Section 24(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied on the principle that personal expenses are not deductible, even if they are related to one’s occupation or the production of income. The court cited *Henry C. Smith, 40 B.T.A. 1038*, which involved similar facts and disallowed the deduction. The court reasoned that O’Connor’s trade or business was teaching school, and the expense of the nursemaid was a personal expense, not a business

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

expense directly related to her teaching activities. The court emphasized that Section 24(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code expressly prohibits the deduction of personal expenses. The court stated, “Since the disputed deduction at bar was a ‘personal’ expense, therefore it is not deductible. Sec. 24 (a) (1), I. R. C.” The court distinguished the case from *Bingham Trust v. Commissioner, 325 U.S. 365*, noting that *Bingham Trust* did not affect the prohibition against deducting personal expenses.

Practical Implications

This case established a precedent that childcare expenses are generally considered personal expenses and are not deductible for federal income tax purposes. This ruling has significant implications for working parents, as it clarifies that the cost of enabling them to work is considered a personal expense. While the tax code has evolved since 1946 to include some credits for childcare expenses, this case is a reminder of the general rule that personal expenses are not deductible, and it highlights the ongoing debate about the tax treatment of childcare expenses. Later cases and legislative changes have carved out specific exceptions and credits, but the core principle from *O’Connor* remains relevant in distinguishing between deductible business expenses and non-deductible personal expenses. This case also guides the interpretation of what constitutes a “business expense” versus a “personal expense,” informing tax planning and compliance for individuals and businesses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.