Cornman v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 653 (1975)

Taxpayers residing abroad may deduct business expenses under section 162(a) even if they earn no income that year, as long as the expenses are not allocable to exempt income.

Summary

Ivor Cornman, a U. S. citizen residing in Jamaica, claimed deductions for biological research expenses on his 1970 tax return, despite earning no income from that activity. The Commissioner disallowed the deductions, arguing they were allocable to potential exempt income under section 911(a). The Tax Court held that without actual exempt income, section 911(a) did not apply, allowing Cornman to deduct his expenses under section 162(a). The decision emphasized the need for actual income to trigger section 911(a)'s disallowance provision, preventing a double tax benefit.

Facts

Ivor Cornman, a U. S. citizen living in Jamaica since 1963, was engaged in self-employed biological research. In 1970, he earned no income from his research but incurred expenses of $7,496, including salaries, rent, transportation, storage, and a retirement trust fee. Cornman and his wife filed a joint return for 1970, where his wife reported $7,000 in income from secretarial and lab technician services, which was excluded under section 911(a). Cornman claimed the research expenses as deductions.

Procedural History

The Commissioner disallowed Cornman's claimed deductions, asserting they were allocable to income that would have been exempt under section 911(a) if earned. Cornman petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which ruled in his favor, allowing the deductions under section 162(a).

Issue(s)

1. Whether section 911(a) prevents a taxpayer residing abroad from deducting ordinary and necessary business expenses under section 162(a) when no income is earned from the activity in question.

Holding

1. No, because section 911(a) only disallows deductions allocable to or chargeable against income that is actually excluded from taxation. Since Cornman earned no income in 1970, there was no exempt income to which his expenses could be allocable, allowing the deductions under section 162(a).

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court interpreted section 911(a) strictly, requiring the actual presence of exempt income to trigger its disallowance provision. The court noted that the purpose of section 911(a) is to prevent double tax benefits, which would not occur without actual exempt income. The court referenced previous cases like *Frieda Hempel* and *Brewster*, which disallowed deductions only when there was actual earned income. The court also considered the legislative history, which showed Congress's intent to prevent double deductions, but not to disallow expenses when no income was earned. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that expenses should be disallowed based on an attempt to earn income, emphasizing the need for actual income under section 911(a). The court also addressed the separate treatment of income earned by Cornman's wife, concluding that her income did not affect the deductibility of Cornman's expenses.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that taxpayers residing abroad can deduct business expenses under section 162(a) even if they earn no income from the related activity in a given year, as long as the expenses are not allocable to exempt income. Practitioners should ensure that clients' expenses are clearly documented and distinguishable from any exempt income. This ruling may encourage taxpayers to continue business activities in foreign countries without fear of losing deductions due to lack of income in a particular year. Subsequent cases have applied this principle, reinforcing the importance of actual income for section 911(a) to apply. This decision also underscores the need for careful analysis of income and expense allocation when dealing with joint returns and foreign income exclusions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.