Martino v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 840 (1974); 1974 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 43; 62 T. C. No. 90

Legal expenses incurred in defending a primary election victory are not deductible as business expenses under IRC sections 162 and 212.

Summary

Joseph W. Martino, an incumbent alderman, incurred $8,000 in legal fees defending his narrow primary election victory. He sought to deduct these as business expenses. The U. S. Tax Court, applying the precedent from *McDonald v. Commissioner*, held that these legal fees were not deductible under IRC sections 162 and 212 because they were election-related expenses. The court reasoned that such expenses are part of the process of seeking office rather than the performance of office duties, and thus not deductible. Additionally, the court rejected Martino's alternative argument that the expenses were deductible under section 183, as running for office was deemed a profit-seeking activity.

Facts

Joseph W. Martino, an incumbent alderman from St. Louis's eighth ward, ran for reelection in 1971. He narrowly won the Democratic primary by six votes. His opponent, Bruce T. Sommer, contested the results, leading to a legal battle that went through various courts before Martino's victory was upheld. Martino paid $8,000 in legal fees to defend his primary win and sought to deduct this amount on his 1971 federal income tax return as a business expense. The IRS disallowed the deduction, prompting Martino to petition the U. S. Tax Court for relief.

Procedural History

The IRS determined a deficiency in Martino's 1971 federal income tax and disallowed his deduction for the $8,000 in legal fees. Martino filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court to challenge this determination. The Tax Court heard the case and issued its opinion on September 23, 1974, ruling in favor of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Issue(s)

1. Whether legal expenses incurred by Martino in defending his primary election victory are deductible under IRC sections 162 and 212 as ordinary and necessary business expenses or expenses for the production of income.
2. Whether these expenses are deductible under IRC section 183 as expenses incurred in activities not engaged in for profit.

Holding

1. No, because the legal expenses were part of the election process and not related

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to the performance of duties as an alderman.
2. No, because running for office was considered a profit-seeking activity, and thus not deductible under section 183.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on *McDonald v. Commissioner*, which established that election-related expenses are not deductible because they are incurred in the process of seeking office rather than performing office duties. The court found that Martino's legal expenses, although not traditional campaign expenses, were still part of the broader category of election-related expenditures. The court noted that a primary victory does not guarantee a general election win, and thus, the legal fees were incurred in the pursuit of office rather than the protection of an existing office. Additionally, the court rejected Martino's argument that these expenses were deductible under section 183, as running for office was deemed a profit-seeking activity due to the alderman's salary. The court also emphasized public policy considerations, stating that allowing such deductions would effectively have the government subsidize election campaigns, which is contrary to public policy.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that legal expenses incurred in defending a primary election victory are not deductible under IRC sections 162, 212, or 183. Practitioners should advise clients that any costs associated with the election process, including legal fees for defending election results, are not deductible. This ruling reinforces the distinction between expenses incurred in seeking office and those incurred in performing office duties. It also underscores the importance of the *McDonald* precedent in denying deductions for election-related expenses. Future cases involving similar issues will likely cite *Martino* as authority for the non-deductibility of such expenses. This decision may also influence how candidates budget for election-related legal costs, knowing they cannot offset these expenses against their taxable income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.