Edwin R. Curphey, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 73 T. C. 766 (1980)

A taxpayer engaged in the trade or business of renting property can deduct home office and local travel expenses if the home office is the principal place of business for that activity.

Summary

Edwin Curphey, a dermatologist, also managed six rental properties. The key issue was whether he could deduct home office and travel expenses related to his rental activities. The Tax Court held that his rental activities constituted a trade or business under IRC Sec. 280A, allowing him to deduct expenses for his home office used exclusively for rental management. Additionally, travel expenses between his home and rental properties were deemed deductible as business expenses, not commuting costs.

Facts

Edwin Curphey was a dermatologist at Kaiser Permanente Hospital in Honolulu, Hawaii, earning $45,782. 50 in 1976. He also owned and managed six rental properties, which generated $24,760 in gross rental income but resulted in a net loss of $23,043. Curphey used a bedroom in his two-bedroom condominium exclusively as an office for managing his rental properties. He incurred $549 in expenses for this office and $147 in automobile expenses for trips between his home and rental properties.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Curphey's 1976 federal income tax. Curphey petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which held that his rental activities constituted a trade or business, allowing deductions for his home office and travel expenses.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Curphey's rental activities constituted a trade or business under IRC Sec. 280A, allowing him to deduct expenses for using a portion of his residence as an office.
2. Whether Curphey could deduct automobile expenses incurred in travel between his residence and rental properties as ordinary and necessary business expenses under IRC Sec. 162(a).

Holding

1. Yes, because Curphey's rental activities were sufficiently systematic and continuous to constitute a trade or business under IRC Sec. 280A, allowing him to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

deduct home office expenses.
2. Yes, because the travel expenses were incurred for a business purpose, i. e. , to manage the rental properties, and thus were deductible under IRC Sec. 162(a) as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Court's Reasoning

The court determined that Curphey's rental activities constituted a trade or business under IRC Sec. 280A, as evidenced by his personal management of six rental units, including seeking tenants, furnishing units, and preparing them for new tenants. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that rental activities were merely for the production of income under IRC Sec. 212, emphasizing that such activities could rise to the level of a trade or business. The court also held that Curphey's home office was his principal place of business for his rental activities, satisfying IRC Sec. 280A(c)(1)(A). Regarding travel expenses, the court distinguished between commuting and business travel, ruling that trips between Curphey's home office and rental properties were for a business purpose and thus deductible under IRC Sec. 162(a).

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that taxpayers engaged in the rental of real property can deduct home office expenses if the office is used exclusively and regularly as the principal place of business for that activity. It also establishes that travel expenses between a home office used for rental management and the rental properties themselves are deductible as business expenses, not commuting costs. This ruling may encourage taxpayers to maintain meticulous records of their rental management activities and related expenses. Subsequent cases, such as *Meiers v. Commissioner*, have cited Curphey in upholding similar deductions for rental property managers.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.