6 T.C. 926 (1946)

An employee can deduct travel expenses, including automobile expenses, incurred while traveling away from home for work, even if the travel does not involve an overnight stay.

Summary

The petitioner, a store manager, sought to deduct automobile expenses incurred for Sunday trips from his home in Independence to Parsons, Kansas, for work purposes. The IRS argued that the expenses were not deductible because the trips were not overnight. The Tax Court held that the expenses were deductible under Section 22(n)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, finding that "travel…while away from home" includes same-day travel and does not necessarily require an overnight stay. The court emphasized that the travel was required by his employer and was beyond the scope of his regular employment.

Facts

The petitioner was employed as a store manager in Independence, Kansas. Due to a wartime emergency, he was required to travel to Parsons, Kansas, on Sundays to perform additional work for his employer. The petitioner traveled by automobile from his home in Independence to Parsons and back on the same day. He sought to deduct automobile expenses incurred during these trips from his adjusted gross income for income tax purposes.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction for travel expenses. The taxpayer petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether expenses incurred for travel, meals, and lodging while away from home requires an overnight stay to be deductible under Section 22(n)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the phrase "travel * * * while away from home" in its plain and ordinary sense means precisely what it says, and does not require an overnight stay.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the phrase "travel * * * while away from home" should be

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

interpreted in its plain, ordinary, and popular sense. The court found no indication that Congress intended the phrase to require an overnight stay. The court reasoned that it would be absurd to disallow a deduction for an employee who flies from Boston to Washington on business and returns the same day, while allowing a deduction for the same trip taken over two days. The court distinguished the petitioner's situation from those of employees whose regular work inherently involves same-day travel. The court noted that the petitioner's travel to Parsons was extra service attached to his normal employment, and related to the war emergency. The expenses were for travel itself, not for personal needs such as food.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that taxpayers can deduct travel expenses incurred while away from home for work purposes, even if the travel does not involve an overnight stay. The key factor is whether the travel is required by the employer and is related to the employee's work. This ruling provides a more flexible interpretation of "travel…while away from home," benefiting employees who undertake same-day business trips. It emphasizes that tax statutes should be interpreted in their plain, ordinary sense, unless Congress clearly intended a different meaning. Later cases would likely consider if the travel was ordinary and necessary to the taxpayer's business and whether it duplicated personal expenses. This case informs how businesses consider employee travel reimbursements and how employees structure their deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.