9 T.C. 882 (1947)

Expenses for commuting between a taxpayer's home and workplace are generally considered personal expenses and are not deductible as business expenses, even when incurred due to a medical condition requiring a specific mode of transportation.

Summary

John C. Bruton, a lawyer with partial paralysis requiring taxicab transport to work, sought to deduct these fares as business expenses. The Tax Court denied the deduction, holding that commuting expenses are inherently personal and non-deductible under Internal Revenue Code Section 23(a)(1)(A), regardless of the taxpayer's physical condition or the necessity of the transportation for earning income. The court emphasized that deductions are a matter of legislative grace and must fall squarely within the statutory provisions, which do not provide an exception for medical necessity in commuting.

Facts

Bruton, a practicing attorney, suffered partial paralysis following brain surgery, impairing his ability to walk or use public transportation. His doctor required him to continue physiotherapy, live in a building with a swimming pool, and arrange special transport to his office. Bruton used taxicabs for daily commuting between his residence and office, representing the least expensive option given his condition. He claimed deductions for these taxicab fares on his 1942 and 1943 tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Bruton's deductions for taxicab expenses. Bruton petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of his tax liability.

Issue(s)

Whether taxicab fares paid for transportation between a taxpayer's residence and office, necessitated by a physical disability, are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because commuting expenses are considered personal expenses, and neither the statute nor regulations provide an exception based on a taxpayer's physical condition or the necessity of the expense for earning income.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court relied on the principle that deductions are a matter of legislative

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

grace and must be explicitly authorized by statute. It cited Treasury Regulations 111, Section 29.23(a)(2), which states that "commuters' fares are not considered as business expenses and are not deductible." The court distinguished cases cited by Bruton where transportation expenses were deductible because they were directly related to specific business activities beyond mere commuting. The court quoted Commissioner v. Flowers, 326 U.S. 465, noting that the nature of commuting expenses remains the same regardless of the distance traveled. The court emphasized that the taxicab transportation was used "exclusively in transporting petitioner to and from his place of residence and office," and such expense "is necessitated by reason of the petitioner's physical condition, rather than by reason of his business."

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the strict interpretation of deductible business expenses, particularly regarding commuting costs. It clarifies that personal expenses do not become deductible merely because they are necessary for a taxpayer to engage in income-producing activities. Attorneys should advise clients that even medically necessary commuting expenses are generally not deductible as business expenses. Later cases have continued to uphold this principle, requiring a clear and direct connection between the transportation expense and specific business activities, rather than mere travel to and from work. Taxpayers seeking to deduct transportation costs should focus on demonstrating that the expenses were incurred primarily for the convenience of the employer or were directly related to specific job duties performed during the commute.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.