Sharon v. Commissioner, 66 T. C. 515 (1976)

Home office expenses are not deductible if the office is used only incidentally for business, and professional license fees are capital expenditures amortizable over the taxpayer's life expectancy.

Summary

Joel A. Sharon, an IRS attorney, sought to deduct a portion of his apartment rent as a home office expense and to amortize costs related to obtaining licenses to practice law. The Tax Court ruled that the home office expense was not deductible because it was used only incidentally for business, as Sharon's primary office was provided by his employer. However, the court allowed amortization of the costs of professional licenses over Sharon's life expectancy, recognizing these as capital expenditures with a useful life beyond one year. This case clarifies the criteria for deducting home office expenses and establishes the treatment of professional licensing fees as amortizable capital costs.

Facts

Joel A. Sharon, employed as an attorney by the IRS, used a room in his San Mateo apartment as an occasional office for work-related tasks. He also incurred expenses for education and professional licensing in New York, California, and before the U. S. Supreme Court. Sharon claimed deductions for a portion of his apartment rent as a home office expense and sought to amortize the costs of his education and professional licenses over his life expectancy.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in Sharon's income tax for 1969 and 1970. Sharon filed petitions in the U. S. Tax Court, contesting the disallowance of his home office deduction and the treatment of his educational and licensing expenses. The Tax Court issued a decision on June 21, 1976, disallowing the home office deduction but allowing amortization of certain professional licensing fees.

Issue(s)

1. Whether one-sixth of Sharon's apartment rent is deductible as a home office expense under section 162(a) or section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954?
2. Whether Sharon is entitled to amortization deductions under section 167(a)(1) for educational and other expenses incurred to obtain a license to practice law in New York?
3. Whether Sharon may deduct or amortize costs incurred for taking the California bar examination and obtaining admission to courts in California?
4. Whether Sharon may deduct under section 162, or amortize pursuant to section 167, the cost of admission to the U. S. Supreme Court?
5. Whether Sharon is entitled to depreciation deductions with respect to residential

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

rental property owned by him?
6. Whether Sharon is entitled to an award of Tax Court costs?

Holding

1. No, because the home office was used only incidentally for business purposes and did not constitute a separate place of business.
2. No, because the costs of education are personal and nondeductible, but yes for the $25 New York bar examination fee, which is a capital expenditure amortizable over Sharon's life expectancy.
3. No for the California bar review course, as it is a personal educational expense, but yes for other fees related to California licensing, which are capital expenditures amortizable over Sharon's life expectancy.
4. No for deduction under section 162, but yes for amortization under section 167, as the cost of admission to the U. S. Supreme Court is a capital expenditure with a useful life beyond one year.
5. Yes, Sharon is entitled to depreciation deductions on his rental property, with allocations and useful life determined by the court.
6. No, as there is no statutory authority for reimbursing Sharon for the costs of filing his Tax Court petitions.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied section 262, which disallows deductions for personal living expenses, and section 1. 262-1(b)(3) of the Income Tax Regulations, which specifies that home office expenses are deductible only if the home constitutes a place of business. Sharon's use of his apartment room was incidental and did not meet this criterion. For the professional licensing fees, the court applied section 167(a)(1), treating these fees as capital expenditures with a useful life beyond one year, thus amortizable over Sharon's life expectancy. The court rejected Sharon's attempt to include educational expenses in the cost basis of his licenses, as these are personal and nondeductible under section 1. 162-5(b) of the regulations. The court also determined the basis and useful life for depreciation of Sharon's rental property based on the evidence presented.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for taxpayers claiming home office deductions, emphasizing that the home must be a primary place of business, not merely used for convenience. It also clarifies the treatment of professional licensing fees as capital expenditures subject to amortization, which is relevant for professionals in various fields. The ruling may influence how similar cases are analyzed, particularly in distinguishing between personal and business use of home space. Additionally, it highlights the need for taxpayers to clearly document the business use of property and the allocation of costs between personal and business purposes. Subsequent cases may reference Sharon v. Commissioner when

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

addressing the deductibility of home office expenses and the amortization of licensing fees.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.