Jacobs v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 813 (1974)

Expenses for divorce-related legal fees and settlements are not deductible as medical expenses unless they would not have been incurred but for the taxpayer's illness.

Summary

Joel H. Jacobs sought to deduct divorce-related expenses as medical expenses, arguing his psychiatrist recommended divorce to treat his severe depression caused by his marriage. The U. S. Tax Court held that these expenses were not deductible under I. R. C. § 213, as Jacobs would have sought a divorce regardless of his illness. The court emphasized that for an expense to be considered medical, it must be incurred solely due to the illness, and here, the marriage's failure was independent of Jacobs' mental health.

Facts

Joel H. Jacobs married in 1968 and began experiencing marital difficulties almost immediately. By January 1969, Jacobs showed signs of severe depression, which his psychiatrist attributed to the marriage. The psychiatrist recommended divorce as essential for Jacobs' treatment. Jacobs filed for divorce in July 1969, but later settled out of court, paying his wife $11,250 and covering her legal fees of $2,500, plus his own legal fees of $3,280. Jacobs claimed these payments as medical expenses on his 1969 and 1970 tax returns.

Procedural History

Jacobs filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging the Commissioner's disallowance of his claimed medical expense deductions for the divorce-related payments. The case was heard by Judge Tannenwald, who issued the opinion on September 19, 1974.

Issue(s)

1. Whether payments made by Jacobs to his attorney, his wife's attorney, and his wife pursuant to a divorce settlement are deductible as medical expenses under I. R. C. § 213.

Holding

1. No, because Jacobs would have incurred these expenses even without his illness, failing the "but for" test required for medical expense deductions.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the legal rule from I. R. C. § 213 that allows deductions for

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

expenses related to the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease. The court acknowledged Jacobs' severe depression as a qualifying illness but focused on whether the divorce-related expenses were directly related to treating this illness. The court used the "but for" test from cases like Gerstacker v. Commissioner, requiring that the expenses would not have been incurred but for the illness. The court found that Jacobs would have sought a divorce regardless of his mental health, as the marriage was failing from the start. This conclusion was supported by the evidence of ongoing marital conflict and abuse predating Jacobs' depression. The court distinguished this case from Gerstacker, where the legal expenses were necessary solely due to the taxpayer's illness.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for divorce-related expenses to be deductible as medical expenses, they must be shown to be incurred solely due to a taxpayer's illness. Taxpayers and their advisors must carefully assess whether expenses would have been incurred absent the illness. This ruling impacts how similar cases are analyzed, requiring a focus on the origin of the expense rather than its effect on the illness. It also reinforces the narrow interpretation of I. R. C. § 213, limiting deductions for expenses traditionally considered personal or family-related. Subsequent cases, like Kelly v. Commissioner, have similarly applied this strict test, further solidifying this approach in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.