31 T.C. 473 (1958)

To claim an unrelated person as a dependent under section 152(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code, the taxpayer must show that the dependent's principal place of abode is the taxpayer's home and that the dependent is a member of the taxpayer's household, not that the taxpayer resides in the dependent's home.

Summary

The case concerns whether a taxpayer could claim an unrelated homeowner as a dependent. The taxpayer and the homeowner shared expenses and household duties in the homeowner's residence. The court determined that the taxpayer's principal place of abode was in the homeowner's house, not the other way around, and that the living arrangement was mutually beneficial. Since the homeowner's home was her principal place of abode, the taxpayer could not claim her as a dependent under section 152(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code. This decision emphasizes the importance of identifying which party's home is the "principal place of abode" when determining dependency status, especially in situations where the home is owned by someone other than the taxpayer.

Facts

Zelta J. Bombarger, the taxpayer, worked as a salesclerk. She resided with Winnie Stewart in Winnie's home. Winnie had no cash income but had a savings account. The two were not related. They shared household expenses and duties: Bombarger paid for most of the cash expenditures, and Winnie performed the majority of the household tasks. The living arrangement had existed for about 12 years before the trial. Bombarger's son also resided in the home. Winnie owned the house and paid for the house expenses. Bombarger claimed Winnie as a dependent on her 1954 income tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the claimed dependency exemption was not allowable.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Bombarger's income tax for 1954 because she claimed an improper dependency exemption. The taxpayer then brought the case before the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the taxpayer could claim the homeowner as a dependent under section 152(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, considering that they shared expenses and household duties in the homeowner's residence.

Holding

No, because Winnie Stewart's principal place of abode was determined to be her

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

own home, not that of the taxpayer, as per the requirements of section 152(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the interpretation of "principal place of abode" under section 152(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The court noted the living arrangement between the taxpayer and Winnie was mutually beneficial. The court found that Winnie's home was her principal place of abode, and that Bombarger and her son resided in Winnie's home. The court stated, "As we interpret the facts it was not Winnie who had as her principal place of abode the home of the taxpayer (petitioner), but it was the other way around." The court reasoned that, even though the taxpayer contributed most of the cash expenses, the house belonged to Winnie and she performed the majority of the household duties. The court referred to a similar case that involved a convenience arrangement beneficial to both parties.

Practical Implications

This case is important when determining whether a taxpayer can claim an exemption for an unrelated individual. The court's emphasis on the "principal place of abode" highlights that ownership or control of the physical residence is a significant factor, but it is not the sole factor to determine dependency. The decision suggests that tax practitioners should closely examine the facts and circumstances surrounding the living arrangement, including who owns or rents the home, who pays for major expenses, and who performs the majority of household duties. The court's emphasis on the mutual benefits of the arrangement and the lack of a formal agreement underscore the need to look beyond the mere contribution of financial support to establish dependency. This case reinforces the importance of a well-defined factual record to support a dependency claim. This case remains relevant for understanding dependency requirements when unrelated individuals share a household for mutual benefit.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.