

## ***Missouri-Lincoln Trust Co., 1 T.C. 726 (1943)***

A tax levied by a foreign government is considered an income tax for the purposes of the U.S. foreign tax credit if the foreign statute repeatedly refers to the tax as an income tax and computes it based on gross revenue, even if the method of determination doesn't strictly conform to U.S. income tax computation methods.

### **Summary**

Missouri-Lincoln Trust Co. sought a foreign tax credit under Section 131 of the Revenue Acts of 1936 and 1938 for taxes paid to the Mexican government under the "Ley del Impuesto sobre la Renta." The IRS argued that these payments were excise taxes, deductible under Section 23(c), rather than income taxes eligible for the credit. The Tax Court examined the Mexican statute, noting its repeated references to an "income tax" and computation based on gross revenue. The court held that despite differences in computation methods compared to U.S. law, the tax was indeed an income tax, entitling the company to the foreign tax credit.

### **Facts**

Missouri-Lincoln Trust Co. paid taxes to the Mexican government under a statute called "Ley del Impuesto sobre la Renta". The company claimed these payments as income tax credits on its U.S. tax returns for 1937 and 1938. The payments were based on revenue derived from mining properties in Mexico.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the foreign tax credit claimed by Missouri-Lincoln Trust Co., asserting that the Mexican tax was an excise tax rather than an income tax. The case was brought before the U.S. Tax Court to determine the validity of the claimed foreign tax credit.

### **Issue(s)**

Whether the taxes paid by Missouri-Lincoln Trust Co. to the Mexican government under the "Ley del Impuesto sobre la Renta" constitute income taxes for which a foreign tax credit is allowable under Section 131 of the Revenue Acts of 1936 and 1938, or whether they are excise taxes deductible under Section 23(c).

### **Holding**

Yes, because the Mexican statute repeatedly refers to the tax as an income tax, and the tax is computed based on the company's gross revenue from its mining properties, indicating an intent to tax income even if the computation method differs from U.S. standards.

### **Court's Reasoning**

The Tax Court distinguished the case from *Keasbey & Mattison Co. v. Rothensies*, which involved a Canadian mining tax deemed an excise tax. Here, the court emphasized the language of the Mexican statute itself. It noted that Article 1 stated that those liable for payment of the income tax included both domestic and foreign entities whose income or profits were derived from sources within Mexico. Article 27 referred to “the total yearly income of the taxpayer.” Despite the fact that the tax was computed on gross revenue, and not net income as defined under U.S. law, the court reasoned that the method of determination did not change the fundamental nature of the tax. The court cited *Seatrains Lines, Inc.* as precedent, which held that a Cuban tax on gross income was an income tax for U.S. purposes. The court emphasized that deductions from gross income are a matter of legislative grace, and an income tax can be imposed on gross income. The court noted that El Potosi, the entity paying the royalty to the taxpayer, did deduct some expenses before calculating the 10% tax owed to the Mexican government. The Court concluded that the tax was an income tax for the purposes of Section 131.

### **Practical Implications**

This case provides guidance on how to analyze foreign tax statutes to determine whether a tax qualifies as an income tax for the U.S. foreign tax credit. The key takeaway is that the language and structure of the foreign law are critical. The fact that a foreign tax is computed on gross income, rather than net income as defined under U.S. law, is not necessarily determinative. The court will look to whether the foreign statute intends to tax income, even if it does so in a way that differs from U.S. tax principles. This case highlights that U.S. courts will look beyond the specific calculation method and consider the overall intent and structure of the foreign tax law. Later cases would continue to grapple with the nuances of distinguishing income taxes from other types of taxes in the context of the foreign tax credit, emphasizing the importance of a detailed statutory analysis.