Haskins v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1949-78

For the purpose of deducting travel expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, a taxpayer's 'home' is generally considered to be their principal place of business, even if they conduct business in multiple locations and earn more income from a secondary location.

Summary

The Tax Court held that the petitioner, Mr. Haskins, could deduct travel expenses incurred in New York City because his 'home' for tax purposes was Worcester, Massachusetts, where he maintained his residence and principal place of business with Haskins Manufacturing Company. Despite spending time and conducting business in New York with Metropolitan Sales Company, and earning more income from the New York venture, the court determined Worcester remained his tax home. The court reasoned that Worcester was his established residence, principal place of employment, and where he spent the majority of his time. This case clarifies the definition of 'home' for taxpayers with business activities in multiple locations for the purpose of deducting travel expenses.

Facts

Petitioner, Mr. Haskins, maintained a family home in Worcester, Massachusetts, and was employed by Haskins Manufacturing Company there at the beginning of 1945. In 1945, he also started a business venture in New York City under the name Metropolitan Sales Company. During 1945, Haskins spent 216 days in Worcester and 102 days in New York for his business. Although he spent up to four days a week in New York, some weeks were spent entirely in Worcester. Haskins maintained no residence in New York, staying in hotels during his trips. While his income from the New York venture exceeded his Worcester earnings in 1945, his Worcester employment was a significant and permanent source of income, and he spent more time in Worcester overall.

Procedural History

The petitioner claimed a deduction for business expenses related to his New York trips. The Commissioner disallowed a portion of these deductions, arguing that New York was Haskins' 'home' for tax purposes. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court erred in determining that the petitioner's 'home' for the purpose of deducting travel expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code was Worcester, Massachusetts, rather than New York City.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes. The Tax Court held that the petitioner's 'home' was Worcester, Massachusetts, because it was his principal place of business, established residence, and where he spent the majority of his time, despite his business activities in New York.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the petitioner's situation was not one where he maintained a residence in a location separate from his business and then sought to deduct commuting expenses. Instead, Haskins had a long-standing home and principal place of business in Worcester. The court emphasized that Haskins' Worcester employment was a "significant source of income" and "of a permanent character," and that "his roots were in Worcester where he spent the greater part of his time during the tax year." The court distinguished this case from *S.M.R. O'Hara, 6 T.C. 841*, where the taxpayer's principal place of employment was deemed her 'home' despite weekend visits to a family residence elsewhere, because in *O'Hara*, the activity outside the principal place of employment was "comparatively inconsequential." Here, Haskins' Worcester employment was substantial and continuous. The court concluded, "While it is true that his rewards from the New York venture in 1945 exceeded his Worcester earnings for that year, that fact alone cannot shift his 'home' from Worcester to New York." Therefore, the expenses incurred in New York were deductible as being incurred while "away from home."

Practical Implications

Haskins v. Commissioner provides important guidance on determining a taxpayer's 'home' for travel expense deductions when they have business interests in multiple locations. It clarifies that the 'tax home' is generally the principal place of business, not necessarily the location where the taxpayer earns the most income. This case emphasizes factors such as the amount of time spent, the significance and permanence of employment, and the location of one's established residence in determining the tax home. Legal professionals should consider these factors when advising clients on travel expense deductibility, particularly for those with businesses in multiple locations. Later cases and IRS guidance continue to rely on the principles established in *Haskins*, focusing on the objective factors to determine the principal place of business as the tax home.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.