Bussabarger v. Commissioner, 52 T. C. 819 (1969)

Payments made out of personal concern, rather than business necessity, are not deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under IRC Section 162(a).

Summary

Dr. Robert A. Bussabarger sought to deduct payments made to his former medical secretary, Janice Edwards, during her prolonged illness as business expenses. The Tax Court ruled these payments were not deductible under IRC Section 162(a) because they were motivated by personal concern rather than business necessity. The court also disallowed deductions for Christmas parties and fishing trips due to insufficient business connection, and upheld the disallowance of other deductions for lack of substantiation. This case underscores the importance of demonstrating a clear business purpose for expense deductions.

Facts

Dr. Robert A. Bussabarger, a practicing physician, continued to pay salary and benefits to his former medical secretary, Janice Edwards, after she contracted tuberculosis and could no longer work. Edwards was employed by Bussabarger from 1948 until her illness in 1960, after which she performed no further services. Bussabarger continued to pay her a monthly salary from 1960 until her death in 1964, totaling $5,454 in 1963 and $5,069 in 1964, along with social security and pension fund payments. Bussabarger also claimed deductions for Christmas parties, fishing trips, automobile expenses, and tree farm operations, which were partly disallowed by the IRS.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deductions claimed by Bussabarger for the payments to Edwards, as well as for other expenses. Bussabarger petitioned the United States Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court consolidated the proceedings and upheld the Commissioner’s determinations, finding that the payments to Edwards were personal in nature and not deductible, and that other deductions lacked sufficient substantiation or business connection.

Issue(s)

1. Whether salary, FICA, and pension fund payments made by Dr. Bussabarger to Janice Edwards during her illness are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under IRC Section 162(a).
2. Whether Bussabarger is entitled to deductions for the expense of Christmas parties and fishing trips in excess of the amounts allowed by the Commissioner.
3. Whether sums advanced to Edwards and George Walters are properly deductible as business bad debts.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

4. Whether Bussabarger is entitled to deductions for automobile expenses and depreciation in excess of the amounts allowed by the Commissioner.
5. Whether expenses incurred in connection with a tree farm are deductible as business expenses.
6. Whether Bussabarger is liable for the addition to tax under IRC Section 6651(a) for failure to file a timely return for 1963.

Holding

1. No, because the payments were motivated by personal concern and not business necessity.
2. No, because the expenses were not sufficiently connected to the active conduct of Bussabarger's business.
3. No, because Bussabarger failed to establish that the advances were business-related or became worthless in the taxable year.
4. No, because Bussabarger failed to substantiate the business use of the automobile beyond what was allowed by the Commissioner.
5. No, because the tree farm expenses were capital expenditures and not ordinary business expenses.
6. Yes, because Bussabarger failed to file the return timely and did not show reasonable cause for the delay.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court determined that the payments to Edwards were personal in nature, motivated by Bussabarger's personal concern and feeling of responsibility for her well-being rather than any business necessity. The court emphasized that Edwards performed no services during the years in question, and there was no evidence that the payments were made to secure her future services. The court applied IRC Section 162(a), which requires that deductions be for ordinary and necessary expenses incurred in carrying on a trade or business. The court also noted that Bussabarger's failure to substantiate the business purpose of the Christmas parties and fishing trips, and to maintain adequate records for automobile and tree farm expenses, precluded additional deductions. The court relied on precedents like *Snyder & Berman, Inc.* and *Dreikhorn Bakery, Inc.* , which similarly disallowed deductions for payments made out of personal concern during an employee's illness. The court concluded that Bussabarger's late filing of the 1963 return without requesting an extension or showing reasonable cause warranted the addition to tax under IRC Section 6651(a).

Practical Implications

This decision highlights the importance of demonstrating a clear business purpose for expense deductions under IRC Section 162(a). Practitioners should advise clients that payments made out of personal concern, even if related to a former employee, are unlikely to be deductible as business expenses. The case also underscores the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

need for detailed substantiation of business expenses, particularly for entertainment and mixed-use assets like automobiles. Legal and tax professionals should ensure clients maintain accurate records and can clearly demonstrate the business connection of claimed deductions. This ruling may influence how similar cases are analyzed, emphasizing the need for a direct business purpose over personal motives. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this principle, reinforcing the strict standards for deductibility under IRC Section 162(a).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.