Polyak v. Commissioner, 94 T. C. 337 (1990)

Lodging expenses away from home are deductible as medical expenses only if incurred primarily for medical care provided by a physician in a licensed hospital or equivalent facility.

Summary

Earlene Polyak, advised by her physicians to seek a warmer climate due to her chronic heart and lung ailments, spent winters in Florida. The issue was whether her lodging expenses there were deductible as medical expenses under Section 213(d)(2). The Tax Court held that these expenses were not deductible because they were not incurred for medical care provided by a physician in a licensed hospital or equivalent facility. The court also ruled that repair costs on rental property were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 162. This decision clarifies the stringent requirements for lodging expense deductions and the treatment of repair costs in rental property.

Facts

Earlene Polyak suffered from chronic heart and lung issues post-heart surgery, which were exacerbated by extreme temperatures. Her doctors advised her to spend winters in a warmer climate. Consequently, she stayed in Florida for five months each winter in a travel trailer, incurring lodging expenses. She saw a Florida doctor twice during her stay for routine care. Additionally, the Polyaks owned rental properties and incurred expenses for repairing a damaged wooden bathroom floor in one of these properties.

Procedural History

The Polyaks filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's determination of a $945 deficiency in their 1984 federal income tax. They contested the disallowance of medical expense deductions for lodging and other expenses, as well as the characterization of their rental property repair expenses.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the lodging expenses incurred by Mrs. Polyak in Florida are deductible as medical expenses under Section 213(d)(2).
2. Whether the expenses incurred by the Polyaks for repairing the bathroom floor in their rental property are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 162 or must be capitalized under Section 263.

Holding

1. No, because the lodging expenses were not incurred for medical care provided by a physician in a licensed hospital or equivalent facility as required by Section

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

213(d)(2).
2. Yes, because the repair expenses did not materially add to the value of the property nor appreciably prolong its life but were necessary to maintain it in an ordinarily efficient operating condition as permitted under Section 162.

Court’s Reasoning

The court interpreted Section 213(d)(2), which allows lodging expenses as medical expenses only when three conditions are met: the lodging must be primarily for and essential to medical care provided by a physician in a licensed hospital or equivalent facility, and there must be no significant element of personal pleasure, recreation, or vacation involved. Mrs. Polyak’s stay in Florida was primarily to alleviate her chronic ailments by seeking a warmer climate, not to receive specific medical treatment from a physician in a licensed facility. The court distinguished this case from prior rulings like *Commissioner v. Bilder*, where similar expenditures were disallowed. The court also applied the regulations under Section 162, finding that the bathroom floor repair in the rental property did not enhance the property’s value or extend its life but merely maintained it, thus justifying a current deduction under Section 162.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the narrow interpretation of Section 213(d)(2), limiting the deductibility of lodging expenses to situations where the primary purpose is medical care in a licensed facility. Legal practitioners must advise clients accordingly, ensuring that lodging expenses claimed as medical deductions meet these stringent criteria. The ruling on rental property repairs clarifies that such expenditures can be currently deducted if they do not enhance the property but merely maintain it. This can affect how landlords and property managers account for repair costs on their tax returns. Subsequent cases have cited *Polyak* when addressing similar issues, reinforcing its impact on tax law concerning medical and business expense deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.