Dreicer v. Commissioner, 78 T.C. 642 (1982)

To deduct business expenses under I.R.C. § 162, a taxpayer must demonstrate a primary profit motive, even if the activity also provides personal satisfaction.

Summary

The Tax Court held that an individual could not deduct expenses incurred in activities related to travel and food writing because he lacked a bona fide profit motive. Despite substantial expenses and efforts over several years, the taxpayer's income from these activities was minimal. The court emphasized the significance of the taxpayer's financial situation, the duration of losses, and the imbalance between income and expenses. The court's decision underscored that while an activity might offer personal gratification or public service, the deduction of related expenses necessitates a genuine intention to generate profit. The court focused on whether the taxpayer's primary goal was financial gain or personal enjoyment.

Facts

John Dreicer was a wealthy individual with a substantial investment portfolio. From 1972 to 1975, he was engaged in activities related to travel and gourmet food, including extensive travel and dining at expensive restaurants. He collected information and prepared written materials, hoping to develop a successful career as a travel and food writer. He incurred significant expenses, including travel, lodging, and dining costs. He did not have any prior experience in this field and had limited income from his writing efforts (only $366 in income from 1973-1975). His income was dwarfed by his expenses. Dreicer did not take steps to publish his writing and did not actively seek out publishers. The IRS disallowed deductions for these expenses, arguing that the activities were not conducted with a profit motive.

Procedural History

The IRS disallowed Dreicer's claimed business expense deductions for the tax years 1972-1975. Dreicer challenged the IRS's determination in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the taxpayer's activities were engaged in for profit, thereby entitling him to deduct the associated expenses under I.R.C. § 162.

Holding

No, because the taxpayer did not engage in the activities with a primary profit motive.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court applied I.R.C. § 162, which permits deductions for ordinary and necessary business expenses. The court recognized that a taxpayer's activities must be conducted with the primary objective of earning a profit to qualify for the deduction. The court analyzed the facts to determine if a profit motive existed, focusing on the taxpayer's independent wealth, history of losses, and the relationship between income and expenditures. The court considered the following:

- The lack of substantial income from the activity.
- The lengthy period of consistent losses.
- The taxpayer's substantial financial resources that allowed him to sustain the activity regardless of its profitability.
- The disproportionate expenses relative to income.

The court cited Judge Learned Hand in *Thacher v. Lowe*, stating, "It does seem to me that if a man does not expect to make any gain or profit … it cannot be said to be a business for profit… unless you can find that element it is not within the statute…" The court found that the taxpayer's activities were primarily for personal pleasure and enjoyment rather than for profit. The court noted that while the taxpayer's efforts may have been useful or even unique, the absence of a genuine intent to earn money precluded the deduction.

The court emphasized that even if the activity offered pleasure or public service, the profit motive was still essential to justify the deduction of expenses under I.R.C. § 162. The court paraphrased *Louise Cheney*, stating that the taxpayer's intention was not to run a business to make a profit but to obtain personal gratification from fulfilling a recognized need.

Practical Implications

This case is crucial for taxpayers claiming business expense deductions, particularly those engaged in activities that combine business and personal elements. The case underscores that the profit motive must be the primary objective, not merely an incidental byproduct. It warns taxpayers against relying on the potential for profit in the distant future when incurring expenses. The case also influences how the IRS analyzes deductions related to hobbies, writing, or other ventures where expenses may be high and income low. The court's focus on the disproportionate nature of income versus expenses indicates that the IRS and the courts will likely scrutinize activities with a sustained pattern of losses. Subsequent cases have often cited *Dreicer* to deny deductions when the profit motive is not clearly established. Lawyers should advise clients to maintain detailed financial records and documentation to demonstrate a good-faith intention to generate profit, along with concrete steps taken to achieve profitability (e.g., seeking publication).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.