23 T.C. 218 (1954)

A taxpayer's "home" for the purpose of deducting travel expenses is the location of their principal place of business, not necessarily their domicile, and the fair market value of lodging provided by an employer is considered taxable income.

Summary

Wilson John Fisher, a traveling musician, sought to deduct travel expenses, including lodging, meals, and automobile costs. The IRS denied these deductions, arguing that Fisher had no fixed "home" from which he was traveling and that the hotel accommodations provided by his employers constituted taxable income. The Tax Court agreed with the IRS, finding that Fisher's "home" was wherever he was employed, and upheld the inclusion of the fair market value of the lodging as taxable income. The court allowed deductions for the cost of formal clothing and entertainment expenses, estimating amounts using the Cohan rule due to the lack of precise records.

Facts

Wilson John Fisher was a professional musician, performing in hotels and lounges across multiple states. He maintained a mailing address in Milwaukee, where his mother-in-law resided, but he and his family lived primarily in hotels where he was employed. Fisher's engagements varied in length and location. He incurred expenses for formal clothing, entertainment, and travel. His employers, Hotels Duluth and Wausau, provided lodging to Fisher and his family as part of his compensation. He filed income tax returns, claiming deductions for travel expenses, clothing, and entertainment.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Fisher's income tax for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. The Commissioner disallowed deductions claimed by Fisher, leading him to petition the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court considered the issues of whether the expenses were deductible and whether the value of employer-provided lodging was taxable income. The court ruled in favor of the Commissioner regarding the key issues of "home" and taxable income, but did allow some deductions based on the Cohan rule.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Fisher's expenditures for lodging, meals, and automobile expenses were deductible as "traveling expenses while away from home in the pursuit of his trade or business" under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

2. Whether Fisher's expenditures for formal clothing, accessories, and entertainment were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 23(a)(1)(A).

3. Whether the fair market value of the hotel accommodations furnished by Fisher's employers constituted taxable income.

Holding

1. No, because Fisher's "home" for the purpose of the deduction was not Milwaukee but wherever he was employed.

2. Yes, for the formal clothing and entertainment expenses. The court used the Cohan rule to estimate the amounts as the taxpayer did not have sufficient records.

3. Yes, because the lodging provided by the employers constituted compensation in lieu of a higher money salary.

Court's Reasoning

The Court held that Fisher's "home" for tax purposes was not his domicile in Milwaukee, but rather his place of employment. The court cited that Fisher's family lived where his engagements were located and that when he did have engagements in Milwaukee, he did not live at his family's residence. The court determined that he was not "away from home" when incurring those expenses. The court stated, "That petitioner did not have or maintain his residence at 546 North 15th Street, in Milwaukee, during the taxable years, is, in our opinion, clearly established by the facts." Regarding the expenses for formal clothing and entertainment, the court found these to be ordinary and necessary business expenses. However, because Fisher did not keep detailed records, the court applied the Cohan rule, estimating the deductible amount. The court also affirmed that the fair market value of the lodging furnished by the employers constituted taxable income, as it was provided in lieu of a higher cash salary.

Practical Implications

The case highlights the importance of determining a taxpayer's "home" for travel expense deductions. This decision emphasizes that "home" is not necessarily the taxpayer's domicile. This case has an impact on how courts determine "home" for traveling workers. It can be used in cases for other employees who may live away from their homes for work or where the place of employment is their principal place of business. Tax professionals must advise clients to maintain detailed records to substantiate deductions. The court's use of the Cohan rule demonstrates that even in the absence of precise records, some deductions may still be allowed, but the burden is on the taxpayer to provide some basis for estimating the expenses. Employers providing lodging or other benefits as part of compensation should be aware of their taxability, and accurately determine and report the fair market value. Further, the court determined that the control the employer had over the employee's services, per the labor contract, did not affect the outcome of the court's

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

decision.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.