15 T.C. 886 (1950)

Expenses for travel to improve general health are not deductible as medical expenses unless there is a direct and proximate relationship between the expense and the treatment, cure, mitigation, or prevention of a specific disease or illness.

Summary

The Tax Court held that a taxpayer could not deduct the cost of annual trips to Florida as medical expenses, even though a doctor recommended the trips, because the trips were for general health improvement and not directly related to treating a specific disease. The court emphasized that there must be a close connection between the expenses and the cure, alleviation, or prevention of an existing or imminent disease. The ruling underscores the importance of demonstrating a direct therapeutic link for medical expense deductions related to travel and climate changes.

Facts

Samuel Dobkin, a 62-year-old, had a coronary occlusion in 1944. His doctor advised him to spend winters in Florida. Dobkin took annual trips to Florida for several years, including the tax year 1947. He had never vacationed before and had no personal connections in Florida. He sought to deduct the costs of his hotel, food, laundry, and travel to and from Florida as medical expenses.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Dobkin’s deduction for medical expenses related to his Florida trips. Dobkin petitioned the Tax Court for review of the Commissioner’s decision.

Issue(s)

Whether the expenses incurred by the taxpayer for his annual trips to Florida constitute deductible medical expenses under Section 23(x) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the taxpayer failed to demonstrate a direct and proximate relationship between the expenses and the treatment, cure, mitigation, or prevention of a specific disease or illness.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that not all trips to warm climates qualify as deductible medical expenses, even if a doctor recommends them. The court emphasized that a direct

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

connection must exist between the expense and the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of a specific disease or illness, stating, “There must be some existing or imminent illness or existing physical defect which the trip is supposed to alleviate, cure, or prevent.” The court found that Dobkin’s trips were primarily for general health improvement, not to address the specific effects of his past coronary occlusion. The court noted, “There must be a closer relation between the expenditure and some disease, illness, or defect than has been shown here to make travel and living expenses, such as these, deductible as medical expenses under section 23 (x).”

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the limits of deducting travel expenses as medical expenses, particularly for climate-related travel. Taxpayers must demonstrate a direct and proximate relationship between the travel and the treatment or prevention of a specific disease or illness, not merely a general improvement in health. The ruling necessitates detailed documentation and medical evidence linking the travel to a specific medical condition. Later cases applying Dobkin have reinforced the need for taxpayers to provide concrete evidence of a therapeutic connection to justify medical expense deductions for travel. Legal practitioners should advise clients to maintain thorough records and obtain clear statements from physicians specifying the medical necessity of travel for treating a particular condition.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.