

6 T.C. 841 (1946)

When a taxpayer has multiple places of business, their “tax home” for purposes of deducting travel expenses is the location of their principal place of business.

Summary

S.M.R. O’Hara, the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, sought to deduct household expenses incurred in Harrisburg as “traveling expenses” while away from her alleged “home” in Wilkes-Barre, where she maintained a law practice. The Tax Court disallowed the deductions, finding that Harrisburg was her principal place of business due to her full-time government position there. The court reasoned that her activities in Wilkes-Barre were secondary and insufficient to establish it as her tax home, thus the expenses were deemed non-deductible personal expenses.

Facts

O’Hara was appointed Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1939, a full-time position requiring her presence in Harrisburg. She maintained a law practice in Wilkes-Barre, where she had resided prior to her appointment and to which she returned most weekends. She maintained an apartment in Wilkes-Barre. She reported income from her law practice of \$1,825.45 in 1940 and \$247.55 in 1941. She claimed deductions for rent, utilities, and maid service for her Harrisburg lodging.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed O’Hara’s deductions for household expenses in Harrisburg. O’Hara petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies assessed by the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether the expenses incurred by the petitioner for lodging in Harrisburg are deductible as “traveling expenses...while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business” under Section 23(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because Harrisburg was the petitioner’s principal place of business, and the expenses incurred there were not incurred “away from home” for tax purposes but were instead personal, living expenses.

Court’s Reasoning

The court determined that Harrisburg was O’Hara’s principal place of business. Her

duties as Secretary of the Commonwealth required her presence in Harrisburg. Her law practice in Wilkes-Barre was secondary to her government position. Even though her appointment was temporary, the time spent in Harrisburg was substantial. The court stated, “It seems to us that the petitioner’s main interest in Wilkes-Barre during the taxable years was to continue old contacts and cultivate new ones for future use in the event she should decide to return to that city to actively pursue her profession.” The court distinguished the case from others where the taxpayer’s home and principal place of business were in one location, and they were only temporarily away from there in pursuit of business. The court relied on precedent that Section 23(a)(1) may not be used to deduct expenses at the taxpayer’s principal place of business, citing *Mort L. Bixler*, 5 B. T. A. 1181 and *Barnhill v. Commissioner*, 148 Fed. (2d) 913.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on determining a taxpayer’s “tax home” when they have business interests in multiple locations. It emphasizes that the location of the principal place of business, determined by factors such as time spent and income derived, is critical in determining deductibility of travel expenses. It clarifies that maintaining a residence and some business activity in another location does not automatically qualify expenses incurred at the principal place of business as deductible “travel expenses.” *Commissioner v. Flowers*, 326 U.S. 465, cited in a concurring opinion, further refined this area, emphasizing that expenses must be directly connected to the pursuit of the employer’s business, not merely the taxpayer’s personal choices about where to live. Later cases applying *O’Hara* and *Flowers* require a rigorous analysis of the connection between travel expenses and the primary income-generating activity to prevent taxpayers from deducting what are essentially personal living expenses.