Jack Dempsey's Punch Corp. v. Commissioner, 14 T.C. 1035 (1950)

Payments for the use of a celebrity's name and for services rendered are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses if the compensation is reasonable and agreed upon in an arm's length transaction.

Summary

Jack Dempsey's Punch Corporation sought to deduct the full amount paid to Jack Dempsey as a business expense for using his name and services at his restaurant. The Commissioner argued that a portion of the payment was excessive and not deductible. The Tax Court held that the entire payment was deductible as a reasonable and necessary business expense, considering Dempsey's drawing power, comparable compensation from other sources, and the arm's-length nature of the agreement.

Facts

Jack Dempsey, a famous boxer, lent his name to and worked at the petitioner's restaurant, Jack Dempsey's Punch Corporation. In 1942, the corporation paid Dempsey $36,724.72 for the use of his name and his services. The Commissioner challenged the deduction of $12,000 of that amount, deeming it excessive.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed a portion of the deduction claimed by Jack Dempsey's Punch Corporation. The corporation petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether the full amount paid to Jack Dempsey in 1942 for the use of his name and services constitutes a reasonable payment and is thus deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

Yes, because the evidence showed that the payments were reasonable compensation for both the use of Dempsey's name, which was a significant draw for customers, and for the services he provided at the restaurant, and the payment was determined in an arm's length transaction.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that Dempsey's presence and name recognition were crucial to the restaurant's success. Testimony indicated that people frequented the restaurant specifically hoping to see Dempsey. The court also considered Dempsey's earnings

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

from other ventures, such as refereeing prize fights and endorsements, which supported the reasonableness of the compensation. The court emphasized the arm's-length nature of the agreement, noting disagreements among board members regarding compensation and the involvement of a special resolutions committee. The Tax Court also rejected the Commissioner's argument that Dempsey's failure to obtain specific Navy Department permission for his appearances presented a public policy issue, noting that his immediate superior officers approved of his appearances.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates that payments to celebrities for the use of their name and services can be fully deductible if the compensation is reasonable and determined in an arm's-length transaction. The IRS and courts will scrutinize such payments to ensure they are not disguised profit distributions or unreasonable compensation. When determining reasonableness, factors such as the celebrity's drawing power, comparable compensation from other sources, and the negotiation process are relevant. The case highlights the importance of documenting the basis for compensation decisions, especially in closely held corporations, and demonstrates that the lack of formal approvals from external organizations does not automatically invalidate a deduction if the activity is otherwise approved by relevant authorities. Later cases will examine the totality of circumstances to ensure that compensation is not excessive in light of the services performed and the benefit conferred on the business.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.