18 T.C. 649 (1952)

An employee who travels away from their home terminal for work and incurs meal expenses during required rest periods is entitled to deduct those expenses as business-related travel expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

David Anderson, a Railway Express Agency employee, sought to deduct meal expenses incurred during overnight trips between his home terminal in Parsons, Kansas, and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The Tax Court addressed whether these expenses were deductible as business-related travel expenses. The court held that because Anderson's work required him to travel away from his home terminal and he incurred meal expenses during mandatory rest periods before returning, these expenses were deductible under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court distinguished Anderson's situation from a mere "turn-around" run, emphasizing the necessity of rest periods during his long trips.

Facts

David Anderson worked for Railway Express Agency, performing duties on trains between Parsons, Kansas, and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Parsons was his home terminal. His schedule involved making two consecutive round trips between the cities, requiring him to be away from Parsons overnight for 178 nights during the year. During layovers in Oklahoma City, Anderson had rest periods of 2.5 to 3 hours. He purchased meals in Oklahoma City during these rest periods, totaling 267 meals in 1948, at an average cost of $0.75 per meal. He was not reimbursed for these expenses.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Anderson's income tax for 1948. Anderson conceded part of the deficiency but contested the disallowance of meal expense deductions. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's decision, focusing solely on the deductibility of the meal expenses.

Issue(s)

Whether the meal expenses incurred by the petitioner while traveling away from his home terminal for work constitute deductible business expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

Yes, because the petitioner's work required him to travel away from his home terminal, and the meal expenses were incurred during necessary rest periods before

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

commencing the return trip, the expenses are deductible under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that Section 23(a)(1)(A) allows for the deduction of traveling expenses, including meals and lodging, while away from home in pursuit of a trade or business. The court emphasized that Anderson's work schedule involved overnight trips and mandatory rest periods in Oklahoma City. The court distinguished this case from situations where expenses were considered personal, such as in *Louis Drill, 8 T.C. 902*. The court also distinguished Anderson's situation from a "turn-around" run as in *Fred Marion Osteen, 14 T.C. 1261*, where the employee was not required to have an extended rest period away from home. The court referenced I.T. 3395, which stated that railroad trainmen who are required to remain at away-from-home terminals to obtain necessary rest prior to making a further run or beginning a return run to the home terminal are entitled to deduct the cost of room rental and meals while away from home on such runs. The court found that Anderson's situation fit this ruling because the rest periods were necessary for him to safely and effectively perform his job. The court stated, "We think it is too narrow a view of the facts not to regard both round trips as overnight trips. Furthermore, it was necessary for the petitioner to obtain rest at the end of the outbound run before starting upon the return run."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the circumstances under which meal expenses incurred during work-related travel are deductible. It emphasizes the importance of mandatory rest periods and overnight stays in determining whether expenses are business-related rather than personal. The ruling suggests that the length of the rest period should not be the determining factor, but rather the necessity of that rest for the employee to continue performing their duties. The decision has implications for industries involving frequent travel, such as transportation and logistics, where employees routinely incur meal expenses away from their home base. Later cases may distinguish themselves based on the nature of the travel, the length of the layover, and the requirement for rest before continuing work.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.