Novak v. Commissioner, 51 T. C. 7 (1968)

Only full-time salesmen who solicit business primarily away from their employer's place of business qualify as 'outside salesmen' for the purpose of deducting business expenses from gross income.

Summary

In Novak v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether a stockbroker could deduct business expenses as an 'outside salesman' under section 62(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code. Syd Novak, a registered securities salesman, claimed $5,784. 44 in business expenses for 1962. The court applied the Cohan rule and allowed a deduction of $1,700 but ruled Novak was not an 'outside salesman' because his principal work activities were conducted at his employer's office. This decision clarified the definition of 'outside salesman' and the conditions under which business expenses can be deducted from adjusted gross income.

Facts

Syd Novak was employed as a registered representative by Sincere & Co. , a brokerage firm in Chicago. He worked from 9 a. m. to 2:30 p. m. daily at his employer's office, where he entered orders for customers, advised them on investments, and conducted other business activities. Outside these hours, Novak solicited business from customers and potential customers. He incurred various business expenses such as entertainment, club dues, gifts, and transportation, totaling $5,784. 44, which he claimed as deductions. Novak did not keep detailed records of these expenses and estimated them based on a short period.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Novak's claimed business expense deduction, leading to a deficiency determination of $1,515. 12. Novak petitioned the United States Tax Court, arguing he was entitled to deduct these expenses as an 'outside salesman' under section 62(2)(D) of the IRC and still claim the standard deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the expenses claimed by Novak were ordinary and necessary business expenses.
2. Whether Novak was an 'outside salesman' under section 62(2)(D) of the IRC, allowing him to deduct business expenses from gross income while taking the standard deduction.

Holding

1. Yes, because Novak incurred ordinary and necessary business expenses, but

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

under the Cohan rule, only $1,700 was substantiated and allowed as a deduction.
2. No, because Novak was not an ‘outside salesman’ as his principal work activities were conducted at his employer’s office, not away from it.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the Cohan rule, which allows for some estimation of business expenses when records are inadequate, and found that Novak’s deductible business expenses amounted to $1,700. The court then analyzed the definition of ‘outside salesman’ under section 62(2)(D) and the implementing regulation, which requires that an ‘outside salesman’ must solicit business primarily away from the employer’s place of business. Novak’s primary work was conducted at the brokerage office, which disqualified him as an ‘outside salesman. ‘ The court emphasized that incidental activities at the employer’s place of business do not preclude the ‘outside salesman’ classification, but Novak’s principal activities were at the office. The court also noted the legislative intent behind section 62(2)(D) to equalize deductions between self-employed and employee salesmen but found that Novak did not meet the criteria established by the regulation.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for how business expenses are claimed by employees in sales positions. It clarifies that to be considered an ‘outside salesman,’ the employee’s primary work must be away from the employer’s office. This ruling affects how legal practitioners advise clients on tax deductions, particularly for sales employees. It also impacts how businesses structure their sales operations to maximize tax benefits for their employees. The decision has been cited in subsequent cases to distinguish between inside and outside sales activities for tax purposes. Practitioners must ensure clients maintain adequate records of expenses and understand the distinction between inside and outside sales roles to properly advise on potential deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.