Tucker v. Commissioner, 55 T. C. 783 (1971)

Duplicate living expenses incurred due to personal choice rather than business necessity are not deductible under Section 162(a)(2).

Summary

Truman C. Tucker, a teacher, maintained his family residence in Knoxville, Tennessee, but accepted temporary teaching positions in Georgia and North Carolina due to lack of local opportunities. He incurred duplicate living expenses while working away from Knoxville. The Tax Court held that these expenses were nondeductible under Section 162(a)(2) because they resulted from Tucker's personal choice to keep his family residence in Knoxville rather than business necessity. The court reasoned that a taxpayer's tax home is generally where their principal place of employment is located, and Tucker's choice to live separately from his work location was personal, not dictated by his trade or business.

Facts

Truman C. Tucker and his family resided on a farm near Knoxville, Tennessee. After graduating from college, Tucker sought a teaching position in Knoxville but was unable to find one. He accepted a temporary teaching position in Dade County, Georgia, for the 1966-1967 school year, and another in Murphy, North Carolina, for the 1967-1968 school year. His wife and child remained in Knoxville, where his wife was employed. Tucker incurred duplicate living expenses while working in Georgia and North Carolina, totaling $1,330 in 1967. He returned to Knoxville after the school year in Georgia and left the North Carolina position early due to the burden of duplicate expenses.

Procedural History

Tucker filed a joint federal income tax return for 1967 and claimed a deduction for his living expenses while working in Georgia and North Carolina. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency and disallowed the deduction. Tucker petitioned the Tax Court, which held that the expenses were nondeductible, siding with the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Tucker was "away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business" within the meaning of Section 162(a)(2) while teaching in Georgia and North Carolina, allowing him to deduct his living expenses.

Holding

1. No, because Tucker's duplicate living expenses were incurred due to his personal choice to maintain his family residence in Knoxville rather than the demands of his

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

trade or business.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the principle from Commissioner v. Flowers that travel and living expenses must be necessitated by the exigencies of the taxpayer’s business, not personal convenience. Tucker had no business ties to Knoxville, and his employment opportunities there were bleak. The court distinguished between temporary employment, which may justify maintaining two residences, and Tucker’s situation, where his choice to keep his family in Knoxville was personal. The court emphasized that a taxpayer’s “home” for tax purposes is generally where their principal place of employment is located. The majority opinion, supported by a concurrence, rejected the argument that Tucker’s jobs were temporary enough to justify the deduction, as his personal choice to maintain a separate residence was not dictated by business necessity.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that taxpayers cannot deduct duplicate living expenses incurred due to personal choice rather than business necessity. It impacts how similar cases should be analyzed, emphasizing that a taxpayer’s tax home is generally where their principal place of employment is located, not necessarily where their family resides. Legal practitioners must advise clients that maintaining a separate residence for personal reasons does not justify a deduction under Section 162(a)(2). The ruling may affect teachers and other professionals who work away from their family’s residence, as it underscores the importance of aligning one’s tax home with their primary place of employment. Subsequent cases, such as Hollie T. Dean and Laurence P. Dowd, have been distinguished from this ruling, highlighting the need for clear evidence of business necessity for such deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.