Hitchcock v. Commissioner, 66 T. C. 950 (1976)

Expenses incurred by Foreign Service officers during mandatory home leave are not deductible as business expenses under Section 162(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

David Hitchcock, a Foreign Service information officer, sought to deduct travel expenses incurred during his mandatory home leave in the U. S. The Tax Court held that these expenses were not deductible under Section 162(a)(2) as they were inherently personal and not incurred in pursuit of a trade or business. Despite the compulsory nature of home leave mandated by the Foreign Service Act, the court found that the activities during this period were vacation-like and did not directly relate to Hitchcock's employment duties. This decision emphasized that compulsory job requirements do not automatically render related expenses deductible if they are fundamentally personal in nature.

Facts

David Hitchcock was employed by the U. S. Information Agency as a Foreign Service information officer stationed in Tokyo, Japan. In 1972, he returned to the U. S. on home leave as required by the Foreign Service Act of 1946. During his home leave from August 4 to August 31, Hitchcock and his family engaged in vacation-like activities across the U. S. , including renting a cottage in New Hampshire, visiting national parks, and touring various cities. Hitchcock claimed deductions for his personal expenses during this period, such as food, lodging, and car rentals, totaling $950. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue challenged these deductions, asserting that they were personal, living, or family expenses under Section 262 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

Hitchcock filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court after the Commissioner determined a deficiency in his 1972 income tax due to the disallowed deductions. The Tax Court reviewed the case, considering the nature of home leave under the Foreign Service Act and the applicable regulations, and ultimately ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether expenses incurred by a Foreign Service officer while on mandatory home leave in the U. S. are deductible as "traveling expenses * * * while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business" under Section 162(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the expenses were inherently personal and did not constitute business expenses incurred in pursuit of a trade or business. The court found that home leave, despite being compulsory, was akin to a vacation and the expenses incurred were not directly related to the conduct of Hitchcock's employment duties.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the legal standard from Section 162(a)(2), which requires a direct connection between the expenditure and the carrying on of a trade or business. It cited *Commissioner v. Flowers* (326 U. S. 465 (1946)) to emphasize that business exigencies, not personal conveniences, must motivate the expenditure. Despite the compulsory nature of home leave under the Foreign Service Act, the court found that the activities during home leave were vacation-like and did not involve any official duties. The court distinguished *Stratton v. Commissioner* (448 F. 2d 1030 (9th Cir. 1971)), which allowed similar deductions, noting that it was not binding and that the Fourth Circuit, where appeal would lie, had not ruled on the issue. The court also referenced *Rudolph v. United States* (291 F. 2d 841 (5th Cir. 1961)) to support the view that vacation-like expenses, even if compulsory, are personal and not deductible. The court emphasized that the Foreign Affairs Manual treated home leave as a form of vacation, further supporting its conclusion that the expenses were personal.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that expenses incurred during mandatory home leave by Foreign Service officers are not deductible as business expenses. Practitioners should advise clients that compulsory job requirements do not automatically render related expenses deductible if they are inherently personal. This ruling may affect how similar cases are analyzed, particularly for government employees with mandatory leave policies. It underscores the importance of distinguishing between personal and business expenses, even in the context of mandatory leave. Subsequent cases, such as those involving other government employees with similar leave requirements, may reference Hitchcock to deny deductions for personal expenses during mandatory leave periods.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.