13 T.C. 916 (1949)

Expenses incurred by a military officer to move household goods and personal property to a new permanent duty station are considered non-deductible personal expenses, not ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Summary

H. Willis Nichols, Jr., an Army officer, sought to deduct the cost of moving his household effects and automobiles from California to Kentucky as a business expense. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction, holding that these expenses were personal, living, or family expenses, not ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 23(a)(1) or (2) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court emphasized that the expenses were not a necessary incident to the performance of his official duties.

Facts

Nichols, an Army officer, was transferred from Santa Ana, California, to Atlantic City, New Jersey, in September 1944. Due to uncertainty about the long-term location of the Atlantic City headquarters, his family and belongings remained in California. In January 1945, before his assignment to Louisville, Kentucky, his household goods and two automobiles were shipped to Lexington, Kentucky, for storage. In April 1945, Nichols was ordered to Louisville, a permanent station, and moved his family and goods from Lexington to quarters near his new post. He paid $791.65 to the Southern Railroad for transporting his goods from Santa Ana to Lexington and sought to deduct this amount as moving expenses on his 1945 tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Nichols' deduction for moving expenses. Nichols petitioned the Tax Court, arguing that the expenses were ordinary and necessary business expenses. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the cost of moving a military officer's household goods and automobiles from one permanent duty station to another constitutes an ordinary and necessary business expense deductible under Section 23(a)(1) or (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the expenses are considered personal, living, or family expenses, and are not a necessary incident to the performance of official military duties.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court distinguished this case from *Edwin R. Motch, Jr.*, where automobile and entertainment expenses were deemed deductible because they were directly related to the officer’s duties. The court relied on precedent such as *Bercaw v. Commissioner* and *York v. Commissioner*, which held that expenses related to military duty, like mess assessments and moving families, are personal expenses. The court stated, “In the instant case it can not be said that the expense of moving an Army officer’s household goods and automobiles from California to Lexington or Louisville, Kentucky, was a necessary incident to the performance of his official duties. Actually, such expense had nothing whatsoever to do with the performance of his official duties.” The court reasoned that Nichols’ decision to move his family was for personal convenience and comfort, not a requirement of his military service. The functioning of the Headquarters Command was not affected by the presence or absence of his family and belongings. Therefore, the expenses fell under Section 24(a)(1), which disallows deductions for personal, living, or family expenses.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that military personnel cannot typically deduct moving expenses incurred due to permanent change of station orders, as these are considered personal rather than business-related. The case highlights the importance of distinguishing between expenses that are directly related to performing job duties and those that are primarily for personal benefit. Later cases have further refined the definition of deductible business expenses, but the principle remains that personal expenses, even if indirectly related to employment, are generally not deductible. This ruling has implications for how military personnel and other employees should approach claiming deductions for moving or relocation expenses, emphasizing the need to demonstrate a direct connection between the expense and the performance of job duties, rather than personal convenience.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.