San Jose Wellness v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 156 T. C. No. 4 (2021)

In a landmark decision, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that a medical cannabis dispensary, San Jose Wellness, could not deduct depreciation and charitable contributions under I. R. C. § 280E, which disallows deductions for businesses trafficking in controlled substances. This ruling underscores the broad application of § 280E, impacting how such businesses account for expenses and reinforcing the federal stance against marijuana-related tax deductions, even in states where it is legal.

Parties

Plaintiff: San Jose Wellness, a corporation operating a medical cannabis dispensary in San Jose, California, under California law. Defendant: Commissioner of Internal Revenue, representing the U. S. government's interests in enforcing federal tax laws.

Facts

San Jose Wellness (SJW) operated a medical cannabis dispensary in San Jose, California, licensed under state law. SJW sold cannabis to individuals with valid doctor's recommendations and also offered non-cannabis items and holistic services such as acupuncture and chiropractic care. SJW used the accrual method of accounting and filed federal income tax returns for the taxable years 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014, and 2015, claiming deductions for depreciation and charitable contributions. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) disallowed these deductions under I. R. C. § 280E, which prohibits deductions for businesses trafficking in controlled substances. SJW argued that depreciation and charitable contributions should not fall under § 280E's prohibition.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued notices of deficiency to SJW for the years in question, disallowing the claimed deductions and determining accuracy-related penalties under I. R. C. § 6662 for 2014 and 2015, though the penalty for 2014 was later conceded. SJW petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for review. The court consolidated the cases and ruled in favor of the Commissioner, applying the standard of review applicable to tax court decisions.

Issue(s)

Whether the depreciation deduction under I. R. C. § 167(a) and the charitable contribution deduction under I. R. C. § 170(a) are disallowed under I. R. C. § 280E for a business engaged in trafficking controlled substances? Whether SJW is liable for the accuracy-related penalty under I. R. C. § 6662 for the taxable year 2015?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

I. R. C. § 280E provides that "[n]o deduction or credit shall be allowed for any amount paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business if such trade or business (or the activities which comprise such trade or business) consists of trafficking in controlled substances. " I. R. C. § 167(a) allows a deduction for depreciation as "a reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear and tear (including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) of property used in a trade or business. " I. R. C. § 170(a) permits a deduction for "any charitable contribution payment of which is made within the taxable year. "

Holding

The Tax Court held that SJW's deductions for depreciation and charitable contributions were properly disallowed under I. R. C. § 280E. The court determined that SJW's business consisted of trafficking in controlled substances, and thus the statutory conditions for disallowing these deductions were met. The court also upheld the accuracy-related penalty for the taxable year 2015.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning centered on the interpretation of I. R. C. § 280E. It emphasized that the statute disallows deductions for any amount "paid or incurred" during the taxable year in carrying on a business that involves trafficking in controlled substances. The court relied on Supreme Court precedent in Commissioner v. Idaho Power Co. , which established that depreciation represents a cost "incurred" during the taxable year, thereby falling within the ambit of § 280E. Regarding charitable contributions, the court rejected SJW's argument that these were not paid "in carrying on" its business, finding that such contributions were part of SJW's operational activities. The court also considered the broad application of § 280E in prior cases, such as Patients Mutual Assistance Collective Corp. v. Commissioner, and found no reason to depart from these precedents. For the accuracy-related penalty, the court found that SJW failed to demonstrate reasonable cause and good faith in its tax reporting, given the clear legal authority at the time of filing.

Disposition

The Tax Court sustained the deficiencies and the accuracy-related penalty for the taxable year 2015, affirming the Commissioner's determinations.

Significance/Impact

This decision reaffirms the broad application of I. R. C. § 280E, significantly impacting businesses involved in the sale of controlled substances, particularly in the context of state-legal cannabis operations. It clarifies that deductions for depreciation and charitable contributions are not exempt from § 280E's prohibitions,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

even if those expenses are incurred in the course of other business activities. The ruling also underscores the importance of compliance with federal tax laws despite state legalization efforts, potentially influencing future legislative or regulatory responses to the taxation of cannabis-related businesses. Subsequent cases have continued to apply § 280E rigorously, reinforcing its role as a key doctrinal tool in federal tax enforcement against such businesses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.