Hogg v. Allen, 13 T.C.M. 1216 (1954)

An individual operating a business under contract, which requires them to provide personal services and bear financial responsibility for business operations, can deduct losses incurred in that business if the contract was made at arm's length, and the loss was actually sustained.

Summary

The case involves a taxpayer, Hogg, who contracted with a corporation to manage its business operations. The contract stipulated that Hogg would receive any profits but would also bear any losses. During the contract period, the corporation's operations resulted in a significant loss, which Hogg paid and accounted for using the accrual method. The Tax Court addressed whether Hogg's losses were deductible as business losses under Section 23(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court found that Hogg was engaged in his own distinct business of performing the services required by the contract and, therefore, could deduct the incurred losses.

Facts

- Hogg entered into a contract with a corporation to manage its business operations for a 12-month period.
- The contract stated Hogg was to receive profits from the operations but also bear any losses.
- Hogg used the accrual method of accounting.
- The corporation's operations resulted in a loss of $87,348.68.
- Hogg paid a portion of the loss during the period and the remainder was shown as an account receivable from him on the corporation's books.
- Hogg claimed a deduction for the loss under section 23(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

The case was heard by the United States Tax Court. The primary issue was whether Hogg's losses were deductible under Section 23(e)(1). The Tax Court ruled in favor of the taxpayer.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Hogg's activities under the contract constituted a trade or business within the meaning of Section 23(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code, thereby entitling him to deduct the business losses.

Holding

1. Yes, Hogg was engaged in a trade or business, because he was carrying out the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

terms of the contract that required him to furnish personal services in carrying on the business of the corporation, therefore, he could deduct the losses.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that Hogg’s business was distinct from that of the corporation. His business involved providing his personal services to manage the corporation as required by the contract. The court emphasized that although the underlying business belonged to the corporation, the operation of that business and the associated income and expenses were a means to determine the financial outcome of Hogg’s own business (performance of the required services under the contract). The court cited Deputy v. Du Pont, 308 U.S. 488 to support the distinction between the corporation’s business and Hogg’s services. The computation of the net income or loss of the operation of the corporation’s business measured the income or loss of Hogg’s business from the conduct of his own business. The court noted, “His business during those 12 months was to carry out the terms of the contract which required him to furnish personal services in carrying on the business of the corporation.” Because Hogg was engaged in a trade or business under the contract, the losses from the business operations were deductible under the Internal Revenue Code.

Practical Implications

The case clarifies the deductibility of business losses for individuals operating under contractual arrangements. Attorneys and tax professionals should consider this ruling when advising clients who have similar business structures or contracts. It highlights that individuals who provide personal services as part of a contractual obligation, and bear the financial risk of a business’s operations, may be entitled to deduct losses as business expenses. The distinction between the activities of the corporation and those of the individual, as well as the arm’s-length nature of the contract are key considerations when analyzing the deductibility of losses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.