McDermid v. Commissioner, 54 T. C. 1727 (1970)

Dependency exemptions and medical expense deductions are limited by the dependent's income and the source of funds used for medical expenses.

Summary

In McDermid v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled on the taxpayers' eligibility for a dependency exemption and medical expense deductions related to their aunt's care. The taxpayers, who managed their aunt's pension, sought to claim her as a dependent and deduct her medical expenses. The court denied the dependency exemption because the aunt's pension income exceeded $600, the threshold for dependency. Additionally, the court allowed deductions for medical expenses only to the extent the taxpayers used their own funds, excluding the aunt's pension income, which was considered compensation for those expenses.

Facts

Harold and Guinevere McDermid managed the financial affairs of Guinevere's aunt, Clara Schorn, who resided in a nursing home due to a stroke. Clara's pension income, which exceeded $600 annually, was deposited into the McDermids' personal account and used, along with their own funds, to pay for Clara's nursing home expenses. The McDermids claimed Clara as a dependent and sought to deduct all her medical expenses on their tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the McDermids' federal income taxes for 1966 and 1967, disallowing the dependency exemption for Clara and reducing the medical expense deduction by the amount of her pension income. The McDermids petitioned the United States Tax Court to contest these determinations.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the McDermids are entitled to a dependency exemption for Clara Schorn under section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the McDermids are entitled to deduct all the medical expenses for Clara Schorn under section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because Clara's gross income exceeded $600, disqualifying her as a dependent under section 151(e).
2. No, because the medical expenses were only deductible to the extent the McDermids used their own funds, as Clara's pension income used for these expenses constituted compensation under section 213.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied section 151(e), which allows a dependency exemption only if the dependent’s gross income is less than $600. Clara’s pension income exceeded this amount, thus disqualifying her as a dependent. For the medical expense deduction, the court interpreted section 213, which permits deductions for expenses not compensated by insurance or otherwise. The McDermids used Clara’s pension income to pay for her care, which the court considered as compensation under the statute. The court cited precedent cases like Litchfield and Hodge, where similar reimbursements or use of a dependent’s income were disallowed for deductions. The court emphasized that the taxpayers acted as conduits for Clara’s funds, allowing deductions only for the amounts paid from their personal funds.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that taxpayers cannot claim a dependency exemption for individuals whose income exceeds the statutory threshold, even if they manage their finances. It also underscores that medical expense deductions are limited to out-of-pocket expenses when funds from the dependent’s income are used. Practitioners should advise clients to segregate funds used for dependents’ medical expenses to accurately calculate allowable deductions. This ruling impacts how similar cases should be analyzed, emphasizing the importance of distinguishing between the taxpayer’s funds and those of the dependent. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the need for clear financial separation in dependency and medical expense scenarios.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.