Contini v. Commissioner, 76 T. C. 447 (1981)

Expenses for materials related to creating family trusts are not deductible, while expenses for tax preparation materials are deductible under certain conditions.

Summary

Louis P. Contini paid $2,000 for materials from Educational Scientific Publishers (ESP) to establish a family trust, which he argued should be deductible under IRC sections 212 and 162. The U. S. Tax Court held that these expenses were personal and nondeductible under section 262, as they did not relate to existing income-producing assets. However, the court allowed a $51 deduction for tax books used to prepare his 1975 tax return under section 212(3). The decision underscores the distinction between personal and deductible expenses and the importance of existing income-producing assets for section 212 deductions.

Facts

In 1975, Louis P. Contini, an engineer, paid $2,000 to ESP for materials to establish a family trust. He used these materials in 1976 to create the trust, transferring his family home, jewelry, and rights to his services and income into it. Additionally, Contini paid $51 for tax books, which he used to prepare his 1975 tax return. He claimed deductions for both expenses under IRC sections 212 and 162 on his 1975 tax return, which were disallowed by the Commissioner.

Procedural History

The Commissioner disallowed the deductions claimed by Contini, leading to a deficiency determination of $501. Contini petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to challenge this determination. The court heard the case and issued its opinion on March 19, 1981.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $2,000 paid for ESP materials to establish a family trust is deductible under IRC sections 212(1), 212(2), 212(3), or 162.
2. Whether the $51 paid for tax books is deductible under IRC section 212(3) and its regulations.

Holding

1. No, because the expenses for ESP materials were personal under section 262 and not related to existing income-producing assets as required by sections 212(1) and 212(2). They were also not deductible as educational expenses under section 162 or for tax determination under section 212(3).
2. Yes, because the tax books were used to prepare Contini’s 1975 tax return, making the expense deductible under section 212(3) and section 1. 212-1(l) of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

regulations.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied sections 212 and 262, which distinguish between deductible expenses for income production or tax determination and nondeductible personal expenses. The court found that Contini’s payment for ESP materials was a personal expense under section 262, as it was used to change the manner of holding existing property (jewelry and family home) without creating new income sources. The court emphasized that sections 212(1) and 212(2) require a connection to existing income-producing assets, which was absent. The court also rejected the educational expense argument under section 162, as the materials did not maintain or improve Contini’s engineering skills or meet employment requirements. For the tax books, the court found them deductible under section 212(3) because they were used for tax return preparation, aligning with section 1. 212-1(l) of the regulations. The court noted the lack of evidence to allocate any part of the $2,000 to tax-related services or materials from ESP.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that expenses related to creating new income sources or changing the form of holding personal assets are generally nondeductible. Taxpayers must demonstrate a connection to existing income-producing assets for deductions under sections 212(1) and 212(2). It also reinforces the deductibility of expenses directly related to tax preparation under section 212(3). Practitioners should advise clients on the importance of distinguishing between personal and business expenses, particularly in the context of trusts and estate planning. Subsequent cases like Harris v. Commissioner and Gran v. Commissioner have followed this ruling, further solidifying its impact on tax deduction analysis.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.