Moss v. Commissioner, 80 T. C. 1073 (1983)

Daily business luncheon expenses are nondeductible personal expenses, even when used for business discussions.

Summary

In Moss v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that the costs of daily business luncheons held by a law firm were nondeductible personal expenses. John Moss, a partner in the firm, attempted to deduct his share of these expenses, arguing they were necessary for business coordination. The court found that despite the business discussions, the primary purpose of the lunches was personal consumption, thus not qualifying as deductible business expenses under IRC Sec. 162. The decision reinforces the principle that personal expenses, including meals, are not deductible unless they meet specific statutory exceptions.

Facts

John Moss was a partner in the law firm Parrillo, Bresler, Weiss & Moss, which specialized in insurance defense work. The firm held daily meetings at Cafe Angelo during the noon recess to discuss case assignments, scheduling, settlements, and other business matters. These meetings were considered part of the working day, and the firm paid for the meals consumed during these gatherings. Moss sought to deduct his share of these lunch expenses on his personal tax returns for the years 1976 and 1977, claiming them as business expenses under IRC Sec. 162 or as educational expenses.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Moss's deductions, leading to a deficiency determination. Moss petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The court heard the case and issued its opinion on May 25, 1983, ruling against Moss and affirming the nondeductibility of the luncheon expenses.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the costs of daily business luncheons, where business matters were discussed, are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under IRC Sec. 162.
2. Whether these costs can be deducted as educational expenses under IRC Sec. 1. 162-5.

Holding

1. No, because the costs of the luncheons were for personal consumption and do not qualify as business expenses under IRC Sec. 162, despite the business discussions that took place.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the informal exchange of information during these luncheons does not meet the criteria for educational expenses under IRC Sec. 1. 162-5.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the rule that personal expenses are not deductible unless they fall under specific statutory exceptions. It cited IRC Sec. 262, which classifies meals as personal expenses, and noted that the taxpayer bears the burden of proving otherwise. The court distinguished the case from situations where meals were required by employment conditions or were part of a mandatory meal fund, as in Sibla and Cooper. It emphasized that the necessity of the meetings for business purposes did not transform the inherently personal nature of the meal costs into deductible business expenses. The court also rejected the argument that these lunches qualified as educational expenses, stating that informal information sharing does not meet the criteria set by the regulations. The concurring opinion by Judge Sterrett agreed with the result but left open the possibility that meal costs could be deductible in other circumstances where the meetings were less frequent or less routine.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that daily business meals, even when used for legitimate business discussions, are not deductible as business expenses. Legal practitioners should be cautious about claiming deductions for routine meals, even if they occur in a business context. The ruling reinforces the strict separation between personal and business expenses, affecting how attorneys and other professionals structure their business practices. It may lead to changes in how firms manage their expenses, potentially shifting costs away from daily meals towards other deductible business activities. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this principle, distinguishing between routine personal expenses and those necessitated by unique employment conditions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.