17 T.C. 1450 (1952)

r
r

State excise taxes, like cigarette taxes, are not deductible as sales taxes for federal income tax purposes; taxpayers must properly file either joint or separate returns consistent with state community property laws to claim exemptions.

r
r

Summary

r

Louis and Leora Roth contested a tax deficiency, arguing against the determination based on a joint return and disputing the disallowance of several deductions, including cigarette taxes, sewer taxes, telephone costs, and work clothing expenses. The Tax Court upheld the deficiency determination based on a joint return, reversed its prior stance on the deductibility of Oklahoma cigarette taxes, disallowed the sewer tax and work clothing deductions, but allowed the deduction for the telephone. This case clarifies the requirements for deducting state taxes and the proper filing status for married taxpayers in community property states.

r
r

Facts

r

Louis Roth, a railway fireman in Oklahoma, filed an individual income tax return, deducting various expenses. His wife, Leora Roth, filed a separate form seeking a refund of withheld taxes, stating it was not a return. The Commissioner determined a deficiency based on a joint return, combining their incomes. Louis also deducted Oklahoma cigarette taxes paid, a sewer service charge, telephone expenses, and work clothing costs.

r
r

Procedural History

r

The Commissioner determined a deficiency based on a joint return and disallowed

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

several deductions claimed by Louis Roth. The Roths petitioned the Tax Court, contesting these determinations. The Tax Court initially sided with the taxpayer on the cigarette tax issue in a similar case, but that decision was reversed on appeal. The Tax Court then reconsidered its position in light of the appellate decision.

r
r

Issue(s)

r

1. Whether the Commissioner correctly determined the deficiency based on a joint return of the Roths' income.

r

2. Whether the Oklahoma cigarette tax is deductible as a sales tax under federal income tax law.

r

3. Whether the sewer service charge is deductible as a tax.

r

4. Whether the cost of the telephone is deductible as a business expense.

r

5. Whether the cost of work clothing and laundry is deductible as a business expense.

r
r

Holding

r

1. Yes, because the taxpayers' actions indicated an intent to benefit from a joint return, and Oklahoma community property law required them to report income accordingly.

r

2. No, because the Oklahoma cigarette tax is an excise tax, not a sales tax, and the taxpayer did not prove the retailer paid the tax.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

r

3. No, because the sewer service charge is a service fee, not a tax.

r

4. Yes, because the telephone was installed solely to receive work-related calls and was a necessary expense for his employment.

r

5. No, because the work clothing was not a required uniform and was for personal convenience.

r
r

Court’s Reasoning

r

Regarding the joint return, the court noted that Oklahoma law vested each spouse with a one-half interest in the other’s earnings. Since Louis’s return omitted his wife’s income and included income taxable to her, and the couple attempted to claim exemptions as if filing jointly, the Commissioner’s determination was upheld. Regarding the cigarette tax, the court reversed its prior holding in *Williard I. Thompson*, acknowledging the Tenth Circuit’s ruling that the tax was an excise tax, not a sales tax, and that the taxpayer failed to prove the retailer paid the tax. The court deferred to the Oklahoma Supreme Court’s designation of the sewer charge as a service charge rather than a tax. The telephone was deductible as it was solely for work-related communication, while the work clothing was deemed a non-deductible personal expense, as it wasn’t a required uniform. The court stated, “Under these particular circumstances, we think that the cost in question is so closely and directly related to petitioner’s earning of income and reasonably necessary in the course of his employment as to qualify as a deductible expense.”

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.