17 T.C. 403 (1951)

Legal expenses incurred to recover title to property are capital expenditures and not deductible, while those incurred to produce or collect income are deductible under Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

Agnes Pyne Coke sued her former husband to set aside a property settlement and divorce decree, claiming he fraudulently concealed community property. She incurred legal expenses and sought to deduct them as non-business expenses. The Tax Court held that the portion of legal fees allocable to recovering title to property was a capital expenditure and not deductible. However, the portion of fees allocable to the production or collection of income (capital gains from the sale of recovered stock) was deductible as an ordinary and necessary expense under Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court ordered an apportionment of the expenses.

Facts

Agnes Pyne Coke (Petitioner) and her former husband, John R. McLean, entered into a property settlement agreement before their divorce. Petitioner later discovered that certain stock and options acquired during their marriage, and held by McLean, were community property but had been treated as his separate property in the settlement. Petitioner, after remarrying, hired attorneys to sue McLean, seeking to set aside the property settlement and for an accounting of community property. The suit was compromised, with McLean acknowledging the stock and options as community property. The stock and options were sold, and Petitioner received her share of the proceeds, resulting in a capital gain.

Procedural History

Petitioner claimed a deduction for legal expenses incurred in the suit against her former husband. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) disallowed the deduction, treating the expenses as part of the cost of the stock and options sold. Petitioner appealed to the Tax Court, arguing for full deductibility or, alternatively, apportionment of the expenses.

Issue(s)

Whether legal expenses incurred in a suit to recover property and for an accounting, which resulted in the recovery of property and the realization of capital gains, are fully deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses, or whether they should be treated as capital expenditures or apportioned between deductible and non-deductible items.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

No, the legal expenses must be apportioned. The portion of legal expenses allocable to recovering title to property is a capital expenditure and not deductible. Yes, the portion of legal expenses allocable to the production or collection of income (capital gains) is deductible under Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code because these expenses were necessary for the production of income.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that expenses incurred in protecting or recovering title to property are capital expenditures and not deductible, citing *Jones' Estate v. Commissioner* and *Helvering v. Stormfeltz*. The court emphasized that this rule was not altered by the amendment to Section 23(a) of the Code. However, the court noted that Section 23(a)(2) allows deductions for ordinary and necessary expenses paid for the "production or collection of income." Referring to Regulations 111, section 29.23(a)-15(a), the court pointed out that "the term 'income' for the purpose of section 23 (a) (2) * * * is not confined to recurring income but applies as well to gains from the disposition of property." Because the petitioner's suit resulted in the recovery of stock and options, the sale of which generated a capital gain (income), the legal expenses associated with that income production were deductible. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that no income was recovered, given the determination of capital gain. The court distinguished *Margery K. Megargel*, noting that the allocation issue was not addressed there. It cited several cases supporting the apportionment of legal expenses between deductible and non-deductible items.

Practical Implications

This case establishes that legal expenses must be carefully analyzed to determine their deductibility. When a lawsuit involves both recovering property and generating income, the expenses must be apportioned. Attorneys and taxpayers must maintain detailed records to justify the allocation. This principle continues to be relevant in tax law, influencing how legal expenses are treated in various contexts, especially when dealing with mixed motives (e.g., protecting assets and generating income). Subsequent cases have relied on *Coke* to guide the apportionment of legal fees. The case also underscores the importance of properly framing legal claims to ensure that the recovery of income is explicitly included in the relief sought.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.