McCabe v. Commissioner, 76 T. C. 876 (1981)

Commuting expenses remain personal and nondeductible even when additional costs are incurred due to an employer's requirement to carry job-related tools, if those costs are influenced by the employee's choice of residence.

Summary

McCabe, a New York City police officer, sought to deduct the difference between his driving costs and cheaper public transportation options due to a requirement to carry his service revolver, which was prohibited in New Jersey. The Tax Court ruled that these expenses were nondeductible personal costs because they resulted from McCabe's choice to live in a suburb adjacent to New Jersey, not from the direct pursuit of his employer's business. The majority opinion held that the necessity to carry a revolver did not transform commuting expenses into deductible business expenses, despite dissenting opinions arguing for an allocation of the excess costs as business-related.

Facts

Dennis McCabe, a New York City police officer, lived in Suffern, New York, adjacent to New Jersey. His job required him to carry his service revolver at all times while in New York City. The most direct routes to his workplace passed through New Jersey, where carrying the revolver without a permit was illegal. McCabe chose to drive a longer route entirely through New York, incurring higher commuting costs than if he had used public transportation through New Jersey. He claimed a deduction for the difference between his driving expenses and the cost of public transportation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed McCabe's claimed deduction, leading to a deficiency notice. McCabe petitioned the U. S. Tax Court. The court, after considering the case on a stipulated record, ruled against McCabe's deduction claim in a majority opinion, with a concurring opinion and two dissenting opinions filed.

Issue(s)

1. Whether commuting expenses, increased due to an employer's requirement to carry a service revolver, are deductible as business expenses when the employee's chosen residence affects the route of travel?

Holding

1. No, because the increased commuting expenses were primarily a result of McCabe's personal choice of residence, not directly connected to his employer's business needs.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the well-established principle that commuting costs between home and work are personal, nondeductible expenses. McCabe’s additional costs arose from his choice to live near New Jersey, not from his employer’s business requirements. The court distinguished this case from situations where additional costs are incurred for transporting job-related tools regardless of residence location. The majority emphasized that the revolver-carrying requirement was only relevant within New York City, and any additional cost due to New Jersey’s laws resulted from McCabe’s personal decision on where to live. A concurring opinion supported this view but disagreed with any suggestion that excess costs due to tool transportation might be deductible under different circumstances. Dissenting opinions argued that McCabe should be allowed to deduct the excess costs over what he would have spent using public transportation, asserting that these costs were directly caused by his employer’s requirement.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces that commuting expenses remain personal unless directly tied to the employer’s business, even when influenced by job requirements like carrying tools. For attorneys, it emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between personal and business expenses based on the necessity and direct connection to business activities. Practitioners should advise clients that choosing a residence that affects commuting routes does not convert personal expenses into deductible business costs. This case may influence future rulings to scrutinize the direct business purpose of claimed deductions, particularly when influenced by personal choices such as residence location. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this principle, with courts maintaining a strict view of what constitutes a business expense for commuting purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.