Zoltan v. Commissioner, 79 T. C. 490 (1982)

Child care expenses, including summer camp and school trips, may qualify as employment-related expenses for tax credits if primarily incurred to enable employment and ensure the child's well-being.

Summary

In Zoltan v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled on whether various child care expenses qualified for tax credits under Section 44A. Edith Zoltan, an accountant working 55 hours a week, sought to claim expenses for her son's summer camp in Canada, a school trip to Washington, D. C. , and care by her daughter in France. The court allowed the full $1,100 summer camp expense, finding it necessary for her employment and primarily for her son's care. It partially allowed the $116 Washington trip expense, allocating $35 to care, but denied the $350 paid to her daughter due to lack of proof of an employer-employee relationship. This case clarifies the criteria for child care expenses to qualify as employment-related.

Facts

Edith W. Zoltan, an accountant, worked 55 hours per week in 1977 and 1978. During the summer of 1977, she sent her 11-year-old son, Paul, to an 8-week summer camp in Canada, costing $1,100. In 1978, she paid $116 for Paul to attend a school trip to Washington, D. C. , during his Easter vacation. Also in 1978, she paid her 22-year-old daughter, Jeanne, $350 for caring for Paul during his 8-week stay in France. Zoltan claimed these as employment-related expenses under Section 44A to enable her employment.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed these expenses, leading Zoltan to petition the U. S. Tax Court. The court reviewed the case and determined the eligibility of each expense under Section 44A.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $1,100 summer camp expense qualifies as an employment-related expense under Section 44A(c)(2)(A)(ii)?
2. Whether the $116 Washington, D. C. , trip expense qualifies as an employment-related expense under Section 44A(c)(2)(A)(ii)?
3. Whether the $350 payment to Zoltan's daughter for care in France qualifies as an employment-related expense under Section 44A(c)(2)(A)(ii)?

Holding

1. Yes, because the summer camp expense was incurred to enable Zoltan to work and was primarily for her son's care and well-being.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Partially, because while the Washington trip was motivated by care concerns, a substantial portion was educational, so only $35 was allowed as care-related.
3. No, because Zoltan failed to prove her daughter was an “employee” under Section 3121(b), necessary for the expense to qualify under Section 44A(f)(6)(B).

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 44A, which allows a tax credit for expenses incurred to enable employment and ensure the care of a qualifying individual. For the summer camp, the court found that the expense was necessary for Zoltan’s employment and primarily for her son’s care, citing Section 1. 44A-1(c)(3)(i) of the regulations. The court rejected the Commissioner’s argument for prorating the expense based on work hours, noting that 24-hour care was necessary once the decision was made to send the son to camp. For the Washington trip, the court acknowledged the care motive but required allocation between care and educational services, estimating $35 as care-related under the Cohan rule. Regarding the payment to Zoltan’s daughter, the court applied Section 44A(f)(6), which disallows payments to relatives unless they constitute “employment” under Section 3121(b). Zoltan failed to prove this, so the expense was disallowed. Judge Whitaker concurred in part but dissented on the summer camp issue, arguing for a stricter interpretation limiting the credit to expenses directly related to work hours.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that child care expenses, including summer camps and trips, can qualify for tax credits if primarily incurred to enable employment and ensure the child’s well-being. However, expenses must be allocated between care and non-care elements, and payments to relatives require proof of an employer-employee relationship. Practitioners should advise clients to document the primary purpose of such expenses and the nature of care provided by relatives. The case has been cited in subsequent rulings on child care credit eligibility, emphasizing the importance of the primary purpose test and the need for allocation when expenses serve multiple purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.