Glenn v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 270 (1974)

Educational expenses incurred to qualify for a new trade or business are not deductible, even if they also maintain or improve skills in the taxpayer's current profession.

Summary

William D. Glenn, a licensed public accountant, sought deductions for expenses related to a C. P. A. review course and exam. The court found that these expenses were nondeductible under section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code because they were incurred in an attempt to qualify for a new trade or business, namely certified public accounting. Despite Glenn's contention that the course maintained his existing skills, the significant differences in potential practice between a public accountant and a C. P. A. in Tennessee led the court to conclude that he was attempting to enter a new trade or business. The decision underscores the importance of distinguishing between maintaining current skills and qualifying for new professional roles when determining the deductibility of educational expenses.

Facts

William D. Glenn, a Tennessee-licensed public accountant, attended a C. P. A. review course at the University of Alabama and subsequently took the C. P. A. exam in 1970. Glenn claimed deductions for the course tuition, travel, and exam fees on his 1970 tax return. He had been employed as a senior accountant at Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. , where C. P. A. status was a prerequisite for advancement to manager or partner positions. Despite his existing role and experience, Glenn sought C. P. A. certification to enhance his career prospects.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Glenn's deductions, leading to a deficiency notice. Glenn petitioned the United States Tax Court for a review. The court heard arguments and considered evidence, ultimately deciding in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the expenses incurred for the C. P. A. review course and exam are deductible under section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as ordinary and necessary business expenses.
2. Whether the education undertaken by Glenn qualifies him for a new trade or business under section 1. 162-5(b)(3)(i) of the Income Tax Regulations.

Holding

1. No, because the expenses were incurred to qualify Glenn for a new trade or

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

business, certified public accounting, which is distinct from his current profession as a public accountant.
2. Yes, because the education Glenn pursued would lead to qualifying him in a new trade or business, and thus the expenses are nondeductible under section 1. 162-5(b)(3)(i) of the Income Tax Regulations.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied section 1. 162-5 of the Income Tax Regulations, which allows deductions for educational expenses that maintain or improve skills required in the taxpayer's current employment, but not if the education leads to qualification in a new trade or business. The court found that the C. P. A. review course constituted "education" under the regulations, but its primary purpose was to qualify Glenn for certified public accounting, a distinct profession from public accounting in Tennessee. The court emphasized the significant differences in potential scope of practice between a public accountant and a C. P. A. , including the ability to represent clients before tax authorities and the perceived higher level of professional competence. These differences led the court to conclude that Glenn was attempting to enter a new trade or business, rendering the expenses nondeductible. The court also cited precedent that supported this interpretation, such as *Weiler* and *Taubman*, and distinguished the case from examples in the regulations, such as that of a psychiatrist becoming a psychoanalyst, where the new skills did not constitute a new trade or business.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how taxpayers and practitioners should analyze the deductibility of educational expenses. It emphasizes the need to carefully assess whether the education pursued leads to qualification in a new trade or business, even if it also maintains or improves existing skills. Legal and tax professionals must consider the specific differences in professional roles and scopes of practice when advising clients on such deductions. The ruling may influence business practices in professional fields where certification leads to expanded roles, as it highlights the potential tax implications of pursuing such certifications. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling to similar scenarios, reinforcing the principle that educational expenses for new qualifications are typically nondeductible unless they are directly related to maintaining or improving current professional skills.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.