13 T.C. 686 (1949)

r
r

A voluntary payment to cover a shortage in war bond sales by a committee chairman is not deductible as a business expense if the activity bears no genuine relationship to the taxpayer’s existing trade or business.

r
r

Summary

r

N.A. Nicholson, who operated a cocktail lounge and a real estate business, served as chairman of a war bond sales committee. A cash shortage occurred due to mismanagement. Nicholson, feeling morally obligated, covered part of the shortage and sought to deduct this payment from his income tax. The Tax Court denied the deduction, holding that the war bond campaign was unrelated to Nicholson’s businesses, and the payment was a non-deductible voluntary expense. The court emphasized that deductions are a matter of legislative grace and require clear statutory authorization.

r
r

Facts

r

Nicholson operated a cocktail lounge and a real estate business. He volunteered to chair a war bond sales campaign for the Ahepa Society. The campaign involved selling war bonds to the public. Due to poor organization and incompetent clerical assistance, a cash shortage of $2,732.09 arose. Nicholson did not personally handle the funds, but the treasurer did. Nicholson and the treasurer made up the shortage using their own funds.

r
r

Procedural History

r

Nicholson deducted $1,732.09 on his 1944 income tax return, claiming it as a loss.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction, resulting in a deficiency assessment. Nicholson petitioned the Tax Court, arguing the payment was a deductible business expense.

r
r

Issue(s)

r

Whether a taxpayer can deduct as a business expense a voluntary payment made to cover a cash shortage in a war bond sales campaign, when the taxpayer's involvement in the campaign is unrelated to their existing businesses.

r
r

Holding

r

No, because the war bond sales campaign had no connection to Nicholson's cocktail lounge or real estate business, and the payment was a voluntary assumption of responsibility, not a necessary business expense.

r
r

Court's Reasoning

r

The court considered *Deputy v. du Pont, 308 U.S. 488* which stated deductions depend on legislative grace and require clear provision. The court found that Section 23(e) of the Internal Revenue Code allows deductions for losses incurred in a trade or business, transactions entered into for profit, or losses from casualty or theft. Nicholson conceded the loss didn't arise from property damage or theft, and the court found the war bond campaign was entirely unrelated to his businesses. Nicholson's reliance on *Peter Frees, Jr., 12 B.T.A. 737*, was misplaced because that case did not directly address whether the loss was incurred in a trade or business. The court emphasized the lack of nexus between Nicholson's businesses and his voluntary role in the war bond effort, concluding that the payment was a non-deductible voluntary expense.

r
r

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Practical Implications

r

This case reinforces the principle that deductions are strictly construed and require a clear connection to a taxpayer’s business or income-generating activities. It clarifies that voluntary payments, even if made with good intentions, are not deductible business expenses unless they directly benefit or protect the taxpayer’s business interests. Attorneys advising clients on tax deductions must carefully analyze the relationship between the expense and the taxpayer’s business to determine deductibility. The case serves as a reminder that the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.