Johnson v. Commissioner, 77 T. C. 876 (1981)

Educational expenses that qualify a taxpayer for a new trade or business are not deductible as business expenses.

Summary

In Johnson v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed whether educational expenses incurred by real estate agents to become brokers were deductible. Arthur and Geraldine Johnson, employed as real estate agents, sought to deduct expenses for real estate courses required for a broker's license. The court ruled that these expenses were not deductible under IRC section 162(a) because they qualified the Johnsons for a new trade or business as real estate brokers. Additionally, the court upheld the disallowance of certain transportation expense deductions due to insufficient substantiation. The decision emphasized the distinction between the roles of real estate agents and brokers under California law.

Facts

In 1976, Arthur and Geraldine Johnson were employed as real estate agents by Art Leitch Realty Co. in San Diego, California. They enrolled in real estate courses at Anthony Schools to obtain their real estate broker licenses, a requirement under California law. The Johnsons claimed a deduction of $880 for these educational expenses and $5,500 for transportation expenses related to their work as agents. The IRS disallowed the educational expense deduction and part of the transportation expense deduction.

Procedural History

The Johnsons petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to challenge the IRS's disallowance of their claimed deductions. The court heard the case and issued its decision on October 19, 1981, ruling in favor of the Commissioner on both issues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Johnsons could deduct educational expenses incurred for real estate courses under IRC section 162(a).
2. Whether the Johnsons could deduct transportation expenses in excess of the amount allowed by the IRS.

Holding

1. No, because the real estate courses qualified the Johnsons for a new trade or business as real estate brokers, making the expenses non-deductible under IRC section 162(a) and Treasury Regulation section 1. 162-5(b)(3).
2. No, because the Johnsons failed to provide sufficient substantiation for the additional transportation expenses claimed.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied a “commonsense approach” to determine that the educational expenses qualified the Johnsons for a new trade or business. It highlighted significant differences between real estate agents and brokers under California law, including the need for brokers to complete additional courses and pass a licensing examination, and the requirement for agents to be employed by a broker. The court referenced California statutes and case law to support these distinctions. The Johnsons’ intent to open their own brokerage further supported the court’s conclusion. Regarding transportation expenses, the court upheld the IRS’s disallowance due to the lack of substantiation beyond the Johnsons’ testimony. The court cited New Colonial Ice Co. v. Helvering and Welch v. Helvering to emphasize the taxpayer’s burden of proof for deductions.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that educational expenses leading to qualification for a new trade or business are not deductible under IRC section 162(a). Practitioners should advise clients that expenses for courses required to obtain a new professional license (e. g. , from agent to broker) are not deductible, even if they maintain or improve existing skills. The ruling also underscores the importance of thorough substantiation for claimed deductions, particularly for transportation expenses. Subsequent cases have cited Johnson in distinguishing between educational expenses for new versus existing trades or businesses, impacting how taxpayers and their advisors approach deductions for professional development.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.