Patterson v. Commissioner, 6 T.C. 392 (1946)

Compensation paid to a spouse for services rendered in managing rental properties and a partnership business is deductible as a business expense if the services are ordinary and necessary, but the deduction is allowed only in the year the payment is actually made if the taxpayer uses the cash basis accounting method.

Summary

The petitioner sought to deduct salary payments made to her husband for managing her rental properties and participating in her partnership business. The Tax Court held that the payments were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses. The court reasoned that owning and operating rental properties constitutes carrying on a business, and managing a partnership through an agent (her husband) also qualifies as a business activity. However, because the petitioner used the cash basis accounting method, the deduction was only allowed for the year in which the payments were actually made, not when the services were rendered.

Facts

The petitioner owned rental properties and was a partner in H. M. Patterson & Son, which owned one-third of the stock in Family Fund Life Insurance Co. The petitioner's husband managed the rental properties, collected rents, and participated in managing the partnership and the insurance company. The petitioner paid her husband an annual salary of $3,600 for these services. The petitioner lacked business training and experience. The petitioner reported her income using the cash basis method of accounting.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction of the salary payments. The petitioner appealed to the Tax Court, arguing that the payments were deductible as either business expenses or non-business expenses. The Tax Court reversed the Commissioner's determination in part, allowing the deduction in the year the payment was made but not in the year the services were rendered.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the salary paid to the petitioner's husband for managing rental properties and the partnership business is deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the deduction can be taken in the year the services were rendered, or only in the year the payment was actually made, given the petitioner's use of the cash basis accounting method.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the petitioner's activities in owning and operating rental properties and participating in the partnership through her husband constituted carrying on a business, and the services provided by her husband were ordinary and necessary for that business.
2. No, because the petitioner used the cash basis accounting method, which requires deductions to be taken in the year the payment is actually made, regardless of when the services were rendered.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that owning and operating rental properties for income production constitutes "carrying on a business," citing precedent such as *John D. Fackler, 45 B. T. A. 708, affd., 133 Fed. (2d) 509* and *George S. Jephson, 37 B. T. A. 1117*. The court emphasized that the services provided by the husband were both ordinary and necessary for managing these properties. The court stated: "In the carrying on of business it is a usual and customary procedure to employ and pay for trained services which benefit and increase the earnings thereof. Here the necessity for this expenditure by petitioner is demonstrated by the fact that she lacked any training or experience in business affairs." Furthermore, the court determined that managing the partnership through her husband also constituted carrying on a business.

Regarding the timing of the deduction, the court applied the cash basis accounting rules, referencing *East Coast Motors, Inc., 35 B. T. A. 212* and Regulations 111, sec. 29.41-2. The court rejected the argument of constructive payment, noting that the checks were not prepared, signed, or delivered until after the close of the tax year. As the court stated, "The fact remains, however, these checks were not prepared, signed, or delivered until after the close of those respective years. Accordingly there was no such payment or receipt in either case until after the close of the year." Thus, the deduction was only allowed for the year in which the actual payment was made.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that managing rental properties can constitute a business for tax purposes, allowing for the deduction of related expenses, including salaries paid for management services. It also serves as a reminder of the importance of adhering to the taxpayer's chosen accounting method. For cash basis taxpayers, deductions are only permitted in the year of actual payment, regardless of when the services were rendered. This can significantly impact tax planning, particularly when dealing with related-party transactions. Later cases have cited *Patterson* to support the deductibility of expenses related to rental property management and the application of cash basis accounting rules.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.