Golanty v. Commissioner, 72 T.C. 411 (1979)

To deduct business expenses, a taxpayer must demonstrate a bona fide objective of making a profit, even if that expectation is not necessarily reasonable; activities lacking this profit motive are considered hobbies, and related losses are not fully deductible.

Summary

The Tax Court in *Golanty v. Commissioner* addressed whether the taxpayer's Arabian horse breeding operation constituted an activity engaged in for profit under Section 183 of the Internal Revenue Code. Lorriee Golanty, with substantial outside income from her husband's medical practice, operated a horse breeding venture that consistently incurred losses for several years. The IRS disallowed deductions from these losses, arguing it was not an activity engaged in for profit. The Tax Court agreed with the IRS, finding that despite Golanty's efforts and knowledge of horses, she lacked a bona fide profit motive, and the operation resembled a hobby rather than a business. The court emphasized the prolonged history of losses, the lack of business-like changes to improve profitability, and the tax benefits offsetting personal expenses as key factors in its decision.

Facts

Lorriee Golanty, married to a physician, engaged in Arabian horse breeding from 1966 to 1973 and beyond. She had some horse experience from her youth and pursued knowledge about Arabian horses. She purchased horses, including stallions and mares, and invested in property and facilities for breeding. Despite her efforts, the operation consistently generated losses, increasing over the years. Revenues were minimal compared to expenses. Golanty maintained records, advertised horses for sale, and made some operational changes, but losses persisted. Her family had substantial income from her husband's medical practice, which offset the financial impact of the horse breeding losses.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of the Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Golantys' federal income taxes for 1972 and 1973, disallowing deductions claimed from the horse breeding operation. The Golantys petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioners' Arabian horse-breeding operation was an "activity not engaged in for profit" under Section 183(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, the Tax Court held that the petitioners' Arabian horse-breeding operation was an "activity not engaged in for profit" because the petitioner did not have a bona fide expectation of making a profit.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court applied Section 183 of the Internal Revenue Code, which disallows deductions for activities "not engaged in for profit." The court emphasized that the crucial test is whether the taxpayer has a *bona fide* objective of making a profit. While a reasonable expectation of profit is not required, the taxpayer must demonstrate a genuine intention to profit. The court considered several factors outlined in Treasury Regulations Section 1.183-2(b) to determine profit motive, including:

- **Manner of Operation:** Although Golanty kept records, advertised, and made some changes, the court found no evidence that these were used to improve profitability. The records were more for pedigree tracking than business analysis.
- **Expertise:** Golanty lacked initial expertise and, despite gaining knowledge, did not seek professional business advice to improve profitability.
- **Time and Effort:** Golanty dedicated time and effort, but this alone does not establish a profit motive.
- **Asset Appreciation:** No evidence suggested the assets were expected to appreciate sufficiently to offset losses.
- **Success in Other Activities:** Not particularly relevant in this case.
- **History of Profit/Loss:** Consistent, substantial losses over many years strongly indicated a lack of profit motive. The court stated, "A record of such large losses over so many years is persuasive evidence that the petitioner did not expect to make a profit."
- **Occasional Profits:** The operation generated minimal revenue and no real profits.
- **Financial Status:** Substantial income from Dr. Golanty's practice mitigated the impact of the losses, suggesting the activity was not essential for financial support. The court noted that substantial outside income, especially with tax benefits from losses, can indicate a lack of profit motive, particularly with personal or recreational elements.
- **Personal Pleasure/Recreation:** While not explicitly stated as the primary motive, the court implied that personal enjoyment could be a factor given the lack of profit objective.

The court concluded that despite some business-like aspects ("trappings of a business"), the overwhelming evidence pointed to a lack of bona fide profit motive. The prolonged and increasing losses, coupled with the absence of effective measures to improve profitability and the tax benefits offsetting personal expenses, led the court to determine the horse breeding was a hobby, not a business for profit.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Practical Implications

Golanty v. Commissioner is a frequently cited case illustrating the application of hobby loss rules under Section 183. It highlights that merely engaging in activities that resemble a business is insufficient for deducting losses. Taxpayers must demonstrate a genuine and primary profit objective. The case emphasizes the importance of:

- **Documenting a Business Plan:** Having a formal business plan demonstrating intended profitability, market analysis, and strategies to achieve profit.
- **Seeking Expert Advice:** Consulting with business advisors, accountants, or industry experts to improve operational efficiency and profitability.
- **Modifying Operations Based on Losses:** Demonstrating active steps to change business practices to reduce losses and increase revenue, rather than passively accepting continued losses.
- **Profitability Projections:** Showing realistic projections and pathways to future profitability, especially if incurring losses in initial years.
- **Avoiding Commingling Personal and Business Elements:** Separating personal enjoyment from the business objective and minimizing personal use of business assets.

For legal practitioners, *Golanty* serves as a reminder to advise clients to maintain thorough documentation of their business activities, demonstrate active efforts to achieve profitability, and understand that prolonged losses without demonstrable profit-seeking behavior can lead to loss deduction disallowance under Section 183. This case is particularly relevant in advising clients in ventures that may have elements of personal enjoyment or recreation, such as farming, horse breeding, or art-related activities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.