Zimmerman v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 367 (1978)

Commuting expenses between a taxpayer's residence and school are nondeductible personal expenses, even if the taxpayer is in a trade or business and attending school to maintain or improve skills.

Summary

In Zimmerman v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that Starr Zimmerman, a teacher attending school during unemployment, could not deduct her transportation costs between home and school. The court held these were nondeductible commuting expenses under Section 262(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, despite allowing deductions for her tuition and other educational expenses. The decision underscores that transportation costs to and from a regular place of business, even if that place is a school attended for professional development, are personal and not deductible as business expenses under Section 162(a).

Facts

Starr Q. Zimmerman, a professional teacher, was unemployed during 1973 but attended courses at Hunter College in New York City to maintain her teaching skills. She lived in Briarcliff Manor, about 30 miles from the college, and incurred $564 in transportation costs traveling to and from school. On their 1973 tax return, the Zimmermans claimed a deduction for these travel expenses along with other educational costs. The IRS allowed deductions for tuition, fees, and books but disallowed the travel expenses, deeming them personal commuting costs.

Procedural History

The Zimmermans filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the disallowance of their travel expense deduction. The case was submitted on a stipulated record. The Tax Court, presided over by Judge Tannenwald, ultimately decided in favor of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Starr Zimmerman, a teacher attending school during unemployment, can deduct her transportation costs between her residence and school under Section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the transportation expenses were deemed nondeductible commuting costs under Section 262(a), as they were incurred for personal convenience rather than business necessity.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court’s decision hinged on the distinction between deductible business expenses and nondeductible personal expenses. It relied on the principle established in Commissioner v. Flowers (326 U. S. 465 (1946)) that transportation expenses must be motivated by business exigencies, not personal convenience, to be deductible under Section 162(a). The court treated Starr as remaining in the teaching profession during her unemployment and attending Hunter College as her principal place of business. Therefore, her travel between home and school was considered commuting, akin to travel to any other workplace, and thus nondeductible under Section 262(a). The court rejected the Zimmermans’ argument that Starr’s home should be considered her tax home, as there was no evidence of business-related activities at her residence. The court also dismissed the relevance of the IRS’s allowance of other educational expenses, noting that such a concession does not extend to all related expenses, particularly those classified as personal under the tax code.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that unemployed taxpayers attending school to maintain or improve professional skills cannot deduct their daily transportation costs as business expenses. It reinforces the principle that commuting expenses, regardless of the nature of the destination or the distance traveled, are personal and not deductible. Legal practitioners should advise clients in similar situations that only expenses directly related to the maintenance or improvement of professional skills, such as tuition and books, may be deductible, while commuting costs remain nondeductible. This ruling may impact how unemployed professionals pursuing education plan their finances, as they cannot rely on tax deductions to offset transportation costs. Subsequent cases, such as Hitt v. Commissioner (T. C. Memo 1978-66), have distinguished Zimmerman by allowing deductions for travel expenses incurred while away from home overnight, highlighting the narrow scope of the Zimmerman ruling to daily commuting costs.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.