Herrick v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 562 (1975)

Advances by attorneys to clients under contingency fee arrangements, expected to be repaid, are not deductible as business expenses under Section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In Herrick v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court held that advances made by an attorney to clients for litigation costs, with an expectation of repayment, were not deductible business expenses. John Herrick, an attorney specializing in workmen's compensation and personal injury cases, advanced funds to clients with the understanding that they would be repaid from any recovery. The court ruled these were loans, not deductible expenses, under Section 162(a). Additionally, Herrick's unsubstantiated entertainment expense claim of $4,800 was disallowed due to lack of corroborating evidence, as required by Section 274(d).

Facts

John W. Herrick, an attorney in Fort Worth, Texas, primarily handled workmen's compensation and personal injury cases on a contingency fee basis. His clients were from low-income groups unable to afford upfront litigation costs. Herrick customarily paid these costs, expecting reimbursement from any recovery. In 1969, he disbursed $328,195. 45 to clients and on their behalf, receiving $306,879. 62 in reimbursements, resulting in a net advance of $21,315. 83. Herrick deducted this amount from his gross legal fees, reporting $203,764. 90 as gross receipts on his tax return. He also claimed $4,800 in entertainment expenses without substantiation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Herrick's deductions, leading to a deficiency determination of $15,937. 92. Herrick petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which reviewed the case and issued its decision on February 27, 1975.

Issue(s)

1. Whether amounts advanced by Herrick to his clients for litigation costs, with an understanding of repayment from any recovery, are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether Herrick's unsubstantiated entertainment expenses of $4,800 are deductible under Section 274(d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the advances were in the nature of loans with a reasonable expectation of repayment, not deductible business expenses.
2. No, because the entertainment expenses were not substantiated as required by

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 274(d).

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the principle that expenditures made with an agreement for reimbursement are loans, not deductible expenses. Herrick’s advances were made with the understanding that they would be repaid from the clients’ portion of any recovery, and he had a high expectation of repayment, recovering about 95% of his advances. The court referenced previous decisions, including Canelo and Burnett, to support its conclusion. Regarding entertainment expenses, the court noted that Section 274(d) requires substantiation, which Herrick failed to provide, relying only on his uncorroborated estimate.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that attorneys cannot deduct advances to clients as business expenses if there is an expectation of repayment, even under contingency fee arrangements. It affects how attorneys handle and report litigation costs in similar practice areas. The ruling also reinforces the need for detailed substantiation of entertainment expenses. Practitioners should maintain meticulous records and consider the tax implications of their fee and cost arrangements. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this principle, emphasizing the distinction between loans and deductible expenses in legal practice.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.