12 T.C. 161 (1949)

Expenses for childcare, even when provided by a practical nurse, are not deductible as medical expenses under Section 23(x) of the Internal Revenue Code if the child is normal and healthy and the care is not directly related to the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of a disease.

Summary

George B. Wendell sought to deduct the salaries paid to practical nurses caring for his infant son as medical expenses. His wife had died in childbirth, and he hired the nurses to provide 24/7 care for the child. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction, finding that because the child was normal and healthy, the care provided did not constitute medical care within the meaning of Section 23(x) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court emphasized that the nature of the services rendered, rather than the qualifications of the caregiver, determined deductibility.

Facts

George B. Wendell's wife died shortly after childbirth. His son, George B. Wendell, Jr., was born on April 20, 1943. During 1944, Wendell employed practical nurses to care for his infant son, hiring them from a list provided by a physician. The nurses provided exclusive care for the child, including sleeping in the same room, and did no housework. The child was normal and healthy, with no physical or mental defects and suffered no particular illnesses in 1944. The household consisted of Wendell, the infant, Wendell's hard-of-hearing mother-in-law, a maid, and the practical nurse.

Procedural History

Wendell deducted the cost of the nurses as a medical expense on his 1944 tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction, resulting in a deficiency assessment. Wendell then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether the salary paid to practical nurses for the care of a normal, healthy infant constitutes a deductible medical expense under Section 23(x) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the services provided by the nurses were not for the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease, or for the purpose of affecting any structure or function of the body within the meaning of Section 23(x) of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that deductions are a matter of legislative grace and that the taxpayer must demonstrate that the claimed deduction clearly falls within the legislative intent. Section 23(x) defines medical care as amounts paid for the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease, or for the purpose of affecting any structure or function of the body. The court emphasized that the child was normal and healthy, without any physical or mental defect. The care provided by the nurses was akin to that of a nursemaid, the cost of which would not be deductible. The court stated that, “Under the facts here present, the money here paid as salary for the nurses does not qualify as being paid for the diagnosis of disease nor its cure or mitigation or treatment. It can be said to have been paid for the prevention of disease only in the same way that the provision of adequate food or adequate sleep or sufficient clothing are all preventives of disease. But by no stretch of the imagination could we hold that in the case of a normal child such provisions were ‘medical care * * * for * * * the prevention of disease.'” The court noted that absent special circumstances of illness, accident, or physical or mental defects, the care of a child is a normal, personal, and parental duty.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that expenses for childcare, even when provided by trained professionals, are not automatically deductible as medical expenses. The key factor is whether the care is directly related to a medical condition or the prevention of disease. This ruling has implications for taxpayers seeking to deduct expenses for dependent care. It emphasizes the importance of demonstrating a direct connection between the care provided and a specific medical need. Later cases have distinguished this ruling by focusing on situations where the care provided was essential for the mitigation or treatment of a specific medical condition. For example, childcare expenses may be deductible if the care allows a parent to receive necessary medical treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.