Tellier v. Commissioner, 383 U.S. 687 (1966)

Legal expenses incurred in the unsuccessful defense of a criminal prosecution arising from a taxpayer's business activities are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under I.R.C. § 162(a), unless the allowance of the deduction would frustrate a sharply defined public policy.

Summary

The Supreme Court addressed whether legal fees incurred in the unsuccessful defense of a criminal prosecution for securities fraud were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses. Tellier, a securities dealer, was indicted and convicted on federal charges. He sought to deduct legal fees and expenses from his income, which the Commissioner disallowed, arguing that such a deduction would frustrate public policy. The Court reversed, holding that the legal expenses were deductible unless explicitly disallowed by statute or when the allowance would frustrate a sharply defined public policy. Because the expenses arose from Tellier's business, they were considered ordinary and necessary, and there was no clear public policy that would be frustrated by allowing the deduction.

Facts

Tellier, a securities dealer, was indicted on federal charges of securities fraud. He incurred significant legal fees and expenses in defending himself, but was ultimately convicted. He claimed these expenses as deductions from his gross income. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deductions, arguing that allowing them would frustrate public policy. Tellier challenged the Commissioner's determination in the Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner. The Court of Appeals affirmed the Tax Court, and the Supreme Court granted certiorari.

Procedural History

The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's disallowance of the deductions. The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the Tax Court's decision. The Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve a conflict among the circuits regarding the deductibility of legal expenses incurred in defending against criminal charges.

Issue(s)

1. Whether legal expenses incurred in an unsuccessful defense of a criminal prosecution arising from a taxpayer's business activities are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under I.R.C. § 162(a).

2. Whether the allowance of the deduction for such expenses would frustrate a sharply defined public policy, thereby precluding the deduction.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, the legal expenses were deductible.

2. No, the allowance of the deduction would not frustrate public policy.

Court’s Reasoning

The Court held that legal expenses arising from a business, even if the business activity is later found to be criminal, are generally deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under I.R.C. § 162(a). The Court reasoned that such expenses are ‘ordinary’ because they commonly arise in the context of business operations. They are ‘necessary’ because they are undertaken to defend against charges arising from the business activities, and failure to defend could result in the destruction of the business. The Court emphasized that the deduction of business expenses is the norm and that any exception to this rule must be firmly grounded in public policy.

The Court distinguished prior cases that denied deductions, explaining those cases were distinguishable because the expenses were directly related to activities that were illegal per se, such as operating an illegal business, and allowing a deduction for the expenses would clearly undermine the law’s enforcement. The Court held that for the expenses to be nondeductible, there must be a “sharply defined national or state policies proscribing particular types of conduct.”

The Court noted that the fact of conviction alone is not sufficient to preclude a deduction, and it is the presence of a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.