

## ***Mazzotta v. Commissioner, 57 T. C. 427 (1971)***

Travel and meal expenses are not deductible when primarily motivated by personal reasons, even if incidental business activities occur.

### **Summary**

Julio Mazzotta sought to deduct travel expenses from his main job to his home, where he also conducted business for a credit union, and meal costs incurred while working at home or at a Knights of Columbus hall. The U. S. Tax Court ruled that these expenses were not deductible under Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code because the primary motivation for Mazzotta's travel was personal, and his meals were not taken away from home overnight. The decision underscores that for expenses to be deductible, they must be directly related to business activities and not primarily for personal reasons.

### **Facts**

Julio Mazzotta worked as an office auditor and later as a revenue agent for the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in New Haven and Bridgeport, Connecticut, respectively. Simultaneously, he served as treasurer for the Middletown Columbus Federal Credit Union, managing its operations from an office in his residence. Mazzotta claimed deductions for travel from his IRS office to his home and for meals eaten at home and at the Knights of Columbus Hall, where he also conducted credit union business.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Mazzotta's claimed deductions, leading to a deficiency determination. Mazzotta petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner's decision, ruling that the expenses were not deductible under Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether the cost of traveling from Mazzotta's major post of employment to his residence, which also served as his minor post of employment, is deductible under Section 162.
2. Whether the cost of meals eaten at Mazzotta's residence and at the Knights of Columbus Hall, while conducting business for the credit union, is deductible under Section 162.

### **Holding**

1. No, because the travel was primarily motivated by personal reasons and not incurred in the course of a trade or business.
2. No, because the meals were not eaten while Mazzotta was away from home

overnight.

### **Court's Reasoning**

The court applied the principle from *Commissioner v. Flowers* (326 U. S. 465 (1946)) that expenses must be directly related to business activities to be deductible. Mazzotta's travel to his residence was primarily for personal reasons, despite conducting some business there. The court rejected Mazzotta's argument that his home was not his tax "home," emphasizing the personal nature of his commute. Regarding meal deductions, the court relied on *United States v. Correll* (389 U. S. 299 (1967)), which holds that meals are only deductible if consumed while away from home overnight. Mazzotta's meals at home and at the Knights of Columbus Hall did not meet this criterion, as he returned home nightly. The court's decision was influenced by the policy of preventing personal expenses from being claimed as business deductions.

### **Practical Implications**

This ruling clarifies that expenses for commuting between a primary job and a secondary job located at one's home are not deductible if the primary motivation is personal. Legal practitioners must advise clients that only expenses directly related to business activities and not primarily for personal reasons are deductible. The decision impacts taxpayers with multiple employments, particularly those working from home, by limiting their ability to claim deductions for travel and meals. Subsequent cases have upheld this principle, reinforcing the strict interpretation of what constitutes a deductible business expense.