Gajewski v. Commissioner, 84 T. C. 980 (1985)

Gambling losses are not deductible in computing adjusted gross income for minimum tax purposes unless the gambler is engaged in a trade or business involving the sale of goods or services.

Summary

In Gajewski v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court held that the petitioner's gambling losses were not deductible for minimum tax purposes under the Internal Revenue Code. The court followed the Second Circuit's mandate to apply the 'goods and services' test to determine if gambling was a trade or business. The petitioner, who gambled for his own account without offering goods or services, failed to meet this test. Additionally, the court rejected the argument that the 16th Amendment required netting of gambling losses against gains, upholding the constitutionality of the tax treatment of gambling losses.

Facts

Richard Gajewski engaged in gambling activities during the tax years 1976 and 1977. He sought to deduct his gambling losses in computing his adjusted gross income for the purpose of calculating his minimum tax liability. The case was remanded to the Tax Court by the Second Circuit, which instructed the court to apply the 'goods and services' test to determine if Gajewski's gambling constituted a trade or business. Gajewski's gambling did not involve dealing with customers or offering any goods or services, which are necessary to meet this test.

Procedural History

Initially, the Tax Court held in favor of Gajewski, allowing the deduction of his gambling losses based on a 'facts and circumstances' test. The Commissioner appealed this decision to the Second Circuit, which reversed and remanded the case, instructing the Tax Court to apply the 'goods and services' test instead. Upon remand, the Tax Court adhered to the Second Circuit's directive and ruled against Gajewski.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Gajewski's gambling activities constituted a trade or business under the 'goods and services' test?
2. Whether the failure of Congress to permit the deduction of gambling losses for minimum tax purposes is unconstitutional?

Holding

1. No, because Gajewski did not offer goods or services as part of his gambling activities, failing to meet the 'goods and services' test.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the broad taxing power of Congress under the 16th Amendment allows for the inclusion of gambling winnings in gross income and the treatment of gambling losses as itemized deductions, subject to statutory limitations.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court was bound by the Second Circuit's mandate to apply the 'goods and services' test, which requires that a taxpayer offer goods or services to be considered engaged in a trade or business. Since Gajewski's gambling was for his own account and did not involve customers or the sale of goods or services, he did not meet this test. The court rejected Gajewski's argument that the 'facts and circumstances' test should apply, as this was explicitly overturned by the Second Circuit. Regarding the constitutional argument, the court held that Congress's power to tax income is broad and includes the ability to tax gross receipts. The court distinguished between 'professional' and 'casual' gamblers, noting that Gajewski was the latter and thus not entitled to the constitutional protection suggested by prior cases involving bookmakers.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how gambling losses are treated for tax purposes, particularly in relation to the alternative minimum tax. Practitioners should advise clients that gambling losses are not deductible in computing adjusted gross income for minimum tax purposes unless the gambling constitutes a trade or business involving the sale of goods or services. The decision reaffirms the broad taxing authority of Congress and its ability to limit deductions for gambling losses. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this ruling, distinguishing between professional gamblers who meet the 'goods and services' test and casual gamblers who do not. This case also highlights the importance of following appellate court mandates in subsequent proceedings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.