Duggan v. Commissioner, 74 T. C. 919 (1980)

Meal expenses incurred by firefighters during 24-hour shifts are not deductible as business expenses under section 162(a) when not required by the employer.

Summary

In Duggan v. Commissioner, Thomas J. Duggan, a firefighter, sought to deduct meal expenses incurred during his 24-hour shifts, arguing they were business expenses under section 162(a). The Tax Court denied the deduction, ruling that these expenses were personal living costs, not business expenses, as Duggan was not required to participate in the station's common mess system and had other meal options available. The decision hinged on distinguishing Duggan's situation from cases where meal expenses were deductible due to mandatory employer participation in a mess system. This case sets a precedent for evaluating the deductibility of meal expenses based on the degree of employer compulsion and the nature of the expense.

Facts

Thomas J. Duggan, a firefighter with the Saint Paul Fire Department, worked 24-hour shifts at Fire Station No. 14. During these shifts, firefighters were required to remain on duty and could only leave the station on business or if ill. The station provided cooking facilities, and a common mess system was operated by the firefighters themselves, where one person cooked and others contributed to the cost of groceries. Participation in this system was optional, and firefighters could bring their own food. Duggan claimed a $5 per day deduction for meals eaten during his 110 shifts in 1976, which the IRS disallowed, classifying them as personal expenses.

Procedural History

Duggan filed a timely Federal income tax return for 1976 and claimed a deduction for meal expenses. The IRS issued a notice of deficiency disallowing the deduction. Duggan petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The case proceeded to trial, where Duggan conceded a portion of the claimed deduction but maintained the deductibility of the remaining amount.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Duggan's contributions to the common mess and house fund at the fire station qualify as ordinary and necessary business expenses under section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the meal expenses were not required by the employer and were considered personal living expenses under section 262, not business expenses under

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

section 162(a).

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the rule that personal living expenses are not deductible unless expressly permitted by another section of the Code. Duggan argued his meal expenses were deductible under section 162(a) as they were incurred while on duty. However, the court found that these expenses did not meet the criteria for business expenses, as they were not different from or in excess of what Duggan would have spent for personal meals. The court distinguished this case from Cooper v. Commissioner and Sibla v. Commissioner, where deductions were allowed because participation in the mess system was mandatory and linked to a racial desegregation plan. In Duggan’s case, participation was voluntary, and he had other meal options available. The court emphasized that the mess system was organized by the firefighters for their convenience, not by the employer, and Duggan’s expenses did not cross the “thin line” between personal and business expenses. The court also cited Murphey v. Commissioner, where similar meal expenses were denied, reinforcing its decision.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how meal expenses for on-duty employees, particularly in professions like firefighting with long shifts, are treated for tax purposes. It establishes that voluntary participation in a common mess system does not transform personal meal expenses into deductible business expenses. Legal practitioners advising clients in similar situations must ensure that any claimed meal deductions are required by the employer and not merely convenient for the employee. This ruling may affect the tax planning strategies of employees in similar roles, emphasizing the need for clear employer mandates regarding meal provisions. Subsequent cases, such as Banks v. Commissioner, have followed this precedent, further solidifying the principle that voluntary meal expenses remain personal and non-deductible.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.