Haverhill Shoe Novelty Co. v. Commissioner, 15 T.C. 517 (1950)

r
r

Expenses related to a shareholder's personal affairs, such as wedding costs, are not deductible by a corporation as ordinary and necessary business expenses, even if the corporation pays them directly.

r
r

Summary

r

Haverhill Shoe Novelty Co. sought to deduct wedding expenses paid for the daughter of its treasurer and majority stockholder. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction, holding that these expenses were personal to the shareholder and not ordinary and necessary business expenses of the corporation. The court reasoned that paying for a shareholder's personal expenses constitutes a gift, which is not deductible except for contributions to specific types of organizations. The court emphasized that allowing such a deduction would be "most extraordinary."

r
r

Facts

r

Haverhill Shoe Novelty Co. paid $6,245.97 for expenses related to the wedding and reception of the daughter of Bernard Glagovsky, the company's treasurer and majority stockholder. The corporation presented canceled checks and bills as evidence of these payments.

r
r

Procedural History

r

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction claimed by Haverhill Shoe Novelty Co. for the wedding expenses. The case was then brought before the Tax Court to determine whether the expenses were properly deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

r
r

Issue(s)

r

Whether expenses incurred for the wedding and reception of the daughter of a corporation’s treasurer and majority stockholder are deductible by the corporation as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

r
r

Holding

r

No, because the wedding expenses are considered personal expenses of the shareholder and not ordinary and necessary business expenses of the corporation. The court viewed the corporate payments as a non-deductible gift to the shareholder.

r
r

Court’s Reasoning

r

The court reasoned that the wedding expenses were fundamentally personal expenses of Bernard Glagovsky, the father of the bride. Even though the corporation directly paid the expenses, this did not transform them into legitimate business deductions. The court stated, “What happened, as we view it, was that in effect the corporation made a gift of these amounts to its treasurer and majority stockholder and gifts are not deductible except to religious, charitable, or educational corporations or foundations.” The court distinguished the facts from situations where expenses might be considered “ordinary” due to unique business circumstances, citing *Welch v. Helvering* but ultimately finding that allowing wedding expenses as a business deduction would be “most extraordinary.” The court emphasized the necessity for expenses to be directly related to