Morris C. Montgomery and Frances W. Montgomery, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 51 T. C. 410 (1968)

Costs of meals and lodging incurred during travel for medical treatment are deductible as 'transportation' expenses under section 213(e)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

Morris and Frances Montgomery sought to deduct expenses for meals and lodging incurred during trips for medical treatment at the Mayo Clinic, and for a trip to California related to estate management. The Tax Court held that the 'in transit' meals and lodging during medical travel were deductible as 'transportation' under section 213(e)(1)(B), interpreting 'transportation' broadly to include such costs. However, the trip to California was not deductible under section 212 as it was not connected to income production. The decision clarified the scope of deductible medical expenses and the limitations on deductions for estate management.

Facts

Morris and Frances Montgomery traveled from Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, to the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota, for medical treatment in 1961. Frances underwent surgery on her feet, requiring multiple trips. They incurred expenses for meals and lodging during these journeys. Additionally, they traveled to California following the death of Frances' aunt, Margaret Edwards, to assist with the estate, incurring further expenses.

Procedural History

The Montgomerys filed a petition in the United States Tax Court challenging the Commissioner's determination of deficiencies in their income tax for 1961 and 1962. The Tax Court heard the case and issued its decision on December 17, 1968, allowing the deduction of 'in transit' meals and lodging but disallowing the deduction for the California trip.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the costs of meals and lodging incurred during travel between Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, and Rochester, Minnesota, for medical treatment are deductible as 'transportation' expenses under section 213(e)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the expenses of a trip to California in connection with settling an estate are deductible under section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court interpreted 'transportation' to include the costs required

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to bring the patient to the place of medical treatment, encompassing ‘in transit’ meals and lodging.
2. No, because the trip to California was not connected to the production of income, and the petitioners’ involvement in the estate was voluntary and personal in nature.

Court’s Reasoning

The court examined the legislative history of section 213(e)(1)(B), finding that Congress intended to limit deductions to actual transportation costs but did not explicitly address ‘in transit’ expenses. The court emphasized the liberal attitude toward medical expense deductions and concluded that ‘transportation’ should include all costs necessary to reach the medical treatment location. The court rejected the respondent’s argument that ‘transportation’ should be narrowly construed, stating that it would deal with potential abuse on a case-by-case basis. Regarding the California trip, the court found no connection to income production, as the Montgomerys were merely volunteers in the estate process. Judge Dawson dissented, arguing that the majority’s interpretation of ‘transportation’ was overly broad and contrary to legislative intent.

Practical Implications

This decision expands the scope of deductible medical expenses under section 213(e)(1)(B) to include ‘in transit’ meals and lodging, providing clarity for taxpayers on what constitutes ‘transportation’ for medical purposes. Legal practitioners should advise clients that such expenses are deductible when traveling for medical care, but they must document the necessity of the travel. The ruling also reinforces the limitations on deductions under section 212 for estate management, emphasizing that deductions are only available for activities directly connected to income production. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent in determining the deductibility of travel expenses for medical care, while also distinguishing it from cases involving personal or non-medical travel.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.