Gentile v. Commissioner, 65 T. C. 1 (1975)

Gambling winnings from personal wagering do not constitute a trade or business for the purposes of self-employment tax under IRC § 1401.

Summary

Alfred Gentile, deriving all his income from gambling, challenged the IRS's imposition of self-employment tax. The Tax Court held that Gentile's gambling activities, despite their regularity and his profit motive, did not constitute a trade or business under IRC § 1402. The court reasoned that Gentile did not offer goods or services to others, a key element of a trade or business. This ruling clarified that personal gambling, even when conducted with skill and regularity, does not subject the gambler to self-employment tax.

Facts

Alfred A. Gentile reported $9,100 in gross income for 1971, all from gambling winnings. His income was mainly from racetrack betting, with additional earnings from private sports wagers and card and dice games. Gentile visited racetracks one to four times a week during the season, betting on two to three races per visit, and spent considerable time studying racing forms. He did not operate a gambling establishment, solicit bets, or act in a representative capacity for others in gambling activities. Gentile had a history of gambling-related arrests and convictions but did not engage in any business-related activities in 1971.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency in Gentile's 1971 federal income tax, asserting that his gambling winnings were subject to self-employment tax under IRC § 1401. Gentile petitioned the Tax Court, which held that his gambling activities did not constitute a trade or business and thus were not subject to self-employment tax.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Alfred Gentile's gambling activities constituted a trade or business within the meaning of IRC § 1402, making his gambling winnings subject to self-employment tax under IRC § 1401.

Holding

1. No, because Gentile did not hold himself out as offering any goods or services to others, which is a necessary element of a trade or business under IRC § 1402.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Tax Court applied the “goods and services” test to determine if Gentile’s gambling activities constituted a trade or business. The court noted that while Gentile’s activities were regular and motivated by profit, these elements alone were insufficient. The court emphasized that a trade or business involves more than generating income, specifically requiring the provision of goods or services to others. Gentile’s personal gambling, where he wagered with his own money without providing services or goods, was likened to managing one’s own estate, which is not considered a trade or business. The court distinguished this from cases where individuals provided services, such as consulting or entertainment, to others. The court also referenced Justice Frankfurter’s concurring opinion in Deputy v. du Pont, which supports the necessity of offering goods or services to others for an activity to be considered a trade or business.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that personal gambling, even when conducted with regularity and skill, does not constitute a trade or business for the purposes of self-employment tax. Practitioners should advise clients that only gambling activities that involve providing goods or services to others, such as operating a gambling establishment or acting as a bookmaker, would be subject to self-employment tax. This ruling impacts how individuals report gambling income and how the IRS assesses self-employment taxes on such income. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the distinction between personal and business-related gambling activities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.