Haines v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 644, 1979 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 187 (1979)

Capital expenditures for medical care are deductible only if the primary purpose is medical care and the expenditure is directly related to such care.

Summary

C. William Haines sought to deduct the cost of constructing a home swimming pool as a medical expense after breaking his leg, arguing it was necessary for his therapy. The Tax Court denied the deduction, holding that the pool's construction was not primarily for medical care nor directly related to it. The court emphasized that the pool served general recreational purposes and was not essential for Haines' medical treatment, highlighting the need for expenditures to be primarily for medical care to qualify under section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Facts

C. William Haines broke his femur in February 1971. After two operations, his doctor recommended physical therapy including swimming. Haines built a swimming pool at his home in April 1972 at a cost of $19,732. 92, claiming a deduction of $13,149. 28 as a medical expense on his 1972 tax return. The pool was used by Haines for exercise, but also by his family and staff. It had no special medical equipment and was only usable from April to October.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the medical expense deduction, leading Haines to petition the United States Tax Court. The court heard the case and issued its opinion on January 25, 1979, denying the deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the cost of constructing a swimming pool at the taxpayer's home qualifies as a medical expense deductible under section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Holding

1. No, because the primary purpose of the pool's construction was not for medical care, nor was it directly related to such care.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code, which allows deductions for medical expenses, and the related regulations under section 1. 213-1, which specify that deductions are allowable only if expenditures are "primarily for" and "related directly to" medical care. The court found that Haines' pool did not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

meet these criteria because it was used for general recreational purposes by others, lacked special medical equipment, and was not essential for his therapy, as alternative and less costly means were available. The court also noted the pool's limited seasonal use and the doctor's testimony, which did not establish a medical necessity for the pool. The court distinguished this case from others where special medical equipment or modifications were involved, emphasizing that convenience alone does not qualify an expenditure as a medical expense.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that capital expenditures like home improvements must be primarily for medical care to be deductible. Practitioners should advise clients that general-use items, even if recommended by a doctor, do not qualify unless they are essential and directly related to medical treatment. This ruling impacts how taxpayers can claim deductions for home modifications and underscores the need for clear evidence of medical necessity. Subsequent cases have referenced Haines to deny similar deductions, reinforcing the strict interpretation of what constitutes a medical expense under section 213.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.