30 T.C. 1230 (1958)

The cost of permanent home improvements, even if medically necessary, is generally not deductible as a medical expense, unlike expenses that do not permanently improve the property.

Summary

In Delp v. Commissioner, the U.S. Tax Court addressed two primary issues: the deductibility of payments made to a family member and the deductibility of expenses for installing a dust elimination system. The court disallowed the deductions for payments to the family member because they were considered personal expenditures arising from a contractual obligation. Regarding the dust elimination system, the court found that while it was medically necessary, the system constituted a permanent improvement to the property and, therefore, was not deductible as a medical expense under section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code. The court distinguished this situation from one involving an easily removable medical device.

Facts

The petitioners, Frank S. and Edna Delp, Edward and Dorothy Delp, and the Estate of W. W. Mearkle, sought to deduct payments made to Charles Delp, and Frank and Edna Delp sought to deduct the cost of installing a dust elimination system in their home. The payments to Charles Delp stemmed from a 1952 agreement, which was a modification of a 1931 agreement where Charles was to receive a portion of partnership income. Edna Delp suffered from asthma and was allergic to dust, and her physician recommended the installation of a dust elimination system. Frank Delp installed the system in 1954 at a cost of $1,750.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the petitioners' income taxes for the years 1952, 1953, and 1954. The petitioners contested the Commissioner's disallowance of their deductions in the U.S. Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether payments made to Charles Delp were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses or nonbusiness expenses?

2. Whether the cost of installing a dust elimination system was deductible as a medical expense?

Holding

1. No, because the payments to Charles Delp were personal expenditures arising

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

from a contractual obligation.

2. No, because the installation of the dust elimination system constituted a permanent improvement to the property, and the expense was therefore a capital expenditure, not a deductible medical expense.

Court's Reasoning

The court held that the payments to Charles Delp were not deductible as business expenses, as the petitioners failed to show they were engaged in a trade or business. They also failed to identify the income-producing property associated with those payments. Regarding the dust elimination system, the court distinguished the case from the *Hollander v. Commissioner* case, where the installation of an inclinator was deemed deductible. The court found that the dust elimination system constituted a permanent improvement to the property, unlike the inclinator in *Hollander*, which was readily detachable. The court reasoned that the installation was a capital expenditure, not a medical expense. The court cited prior case law indicating that permanent improvements are not deductible, even if they are medically necessary.

The court stated, "We have decided, in cases arising under section 23 (x) of the 1939 Code, that expenditures which represent permanent improvements to property are not deductible as medical expenses." The court also referenced the legislative history of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, which did not change the definition of medical care in a way that would allow this expense to be deducted.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the distinction between medical expenses and capital improvements when considering tax deductions. Attorneys should advise clients that expenses for improvements to property, even if medically necessary, are generally not deductible as medical expenses. They must analyze the nature of the improvement and whether it is permanently affixed to the property. If it improves the value of the property, it is unlikely to be deductible. Furthermore, the case underscores the importance of differentiating between ordinary business expenses and personal expenditures in order to determine deductibility. Clients should retain careful documentation to support any deduction claimed.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.