Reading v. Commissioner, 70 T. C. 730 (1978)

The entire amount received from the sale of one's services constitutes income within the meaning of the Sixteenth Amendment, and personal, living, and family expenses are not deductible under Section 262 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In Reading v. Commissioner, the taxpayers argued that their personal, living, and family expenses should be deductible from their income as a "cost of doing labor," asserting these expenses must be recovered before income is realized. The U. S. Tax Court rejected this argument, holding that the entire amount received from labor is income without deduction for personal expenses, as per Section 262. The court emphasized that Congress has the authority to define what constitutes taxable income and to disallow deductions for personal expenses, reinforcing the principle that income from labor includes all compensation received without offset for personal expenditures.

Facts

William H. and Beverly S. Reading, a self-employed engineer and his wife, filed a joint Federal income tax return for 1975. They claimed various personal expenses as miscellaneous deductions, including housing, food, school, repairs to family, and personal upkeep, totaling $10,952. 91. These expenses were disallowed by the Commissioner as nondeductible under Section 262 of the Internal Revenue Code, which prohibits deductions for personal, living, and family expenses. The Readings argued that their true income was not realized until their "cost of doing labor" was recovered, likening it to the "cost of goods sold" in business.

Procedural History

The case was brought before the U. S. Tax Court after the Commissioner disallowed the claimed deductions and determined a deficiency in the Readings' 1975 Federal income tax. The case was submitted fully stipulated, and the court was tasked with determining the constitutionality of Sections 262, 1401, and 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the entire amount received from the sale of one's services constitutes income within the meaning of the Sixteenth Amendment.
2. Whether Section 262 of the Internal Revenue Code, which disallows deductions for personal, living, and family expenses, is constitutional.
3. Whether Sections 1401 and 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to self-employment tax, are constitutional.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the court held that the entire amount received from labor is income without deduction for personal expenses.
2. Yes, because the court found that Congress has the authority to define taxable income and to disallow deductions for personal expenses under Section 262.
3. Yes, because the court recognized the power of Congress to impose self-employment taxes under Sections 1401 and 1402.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the "gain" from labor, as defined by the Supreme Court in Eisner v. Macomber, is the entire amount received from the sale of one's services. The court rejected the Readings' analogy of personal expenses to the "cost of goods sold" in business, emphasizing that labor is not property and personal expenses are not directly related to the "product" sold (labor). The court upheld the constitutionality of Section 262, citing Helvering v. Independent Life Ins. Co. , which affirmed Congress's power to condition, limit, or deny deductions from gross income. The court also noted that the self-employment tax under Sections 1401 and 1402 was constitutional, as it met the geographical uniformity requirement for indirect taxes.

Practical Implications

This decision reaffirms that personal, living, and family expenses are not deductible from income, impacting how taxpayers must calculate their taxable income. It clarifies that income from labor includes all compensation received without offset for personal expenditures, affecting tax planning and compliance. The ruling upholds the authority of Congress to define taxable income and disallow certain deductions, which may influence future tax legislation and court interpretations of the Sixteenth Amendment. Subsequent cases have consistently applied this ruling, reinforcing the principle that personal expenses are not recoverable costs in the context of labor income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.