Albany Discount Corp. v. Commissioner, 40 B.T.A. 139 (1939)

Income is taxable to the individual who earns it, even if that individual subsequently directs the payment of the income to another entity, especially when a contract explicitly designates the individual as the contracting party.

Summary

The Board of Tax Appeals held that commissions earned under a contract between an individual (the petitioner) and Amoco were taxable to the individual, even though the individual claimed to be acting as an agent for a corporation (Albany Co.) and directed the commission payments to the corporation. The Board found that the contract was explicitly between the individual and Amoco, and the individual's attempt to orally assign the contract to the corporation was ineffective due to the contract's requirement for written consent from Amoco, which was never obtained. The individual was therefore liable for the taxes on the commissions.

Facts

Prior to August 1, 1935, the petitioner sought to have Albany Co. employed as an agent for Amoco gasoline sales. Amoco refused because Albany Co. was bound by a contract to deal exclusively in Richfield products.
Amoco then entered into a contract with the petitioner individually, designating him as its agent to procure purchasers of its products, and providing for commission payments to him.
The contract required the petitioner to furnish a fidelity bond, give exclusive time and attention to the employment, and account for all cash sales, imposing personal liability for unauthorized credit sales.
The petitioner personally made all sales, and Amoco paid all commissions to him until September 14, 1938.
On October 28, 1936, the petitioner guaranteed the account of Albany Co. for sales made on credit.
The contract specified that assignment or modification required Amoco's written consent. No such written consent was ever obtained for any assignment of the contract to Albany Co.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined that the commissions paid by Amoco were taxable income to the petitioner. The petitioner appealed this determination to the Board of Tax Appeals, arguing that the commissions were income of the Albany Co. The Board of Tax Appeals reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the commissions paid by Amoco were taxable income to the petitioner individually, or to the Albany Co., based on the contract and the circumstances

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

surrounding its execution and performance.

Holding

No, the commissions were taxable income to the petitioner individually because the contract was made with him in his individual capacity, and any purported assignment to Albany Co. was ineffective without Amoco's written consent, as required by the contract.

Court's Reasoning

The Board found that the contract between Amoco and the petitioner was explicitly with the petitioner in his individual capacity. It noted that the contract designated the petitioner as Amoco's agent and required him to fulfill various obligations personally. Amoco refused to contract with Albany Co. due to its existing contractual obligations.
The Board emphasized that the contract required Amoco's written consent for any assignment or modification, and no such consent was ever obtained. Therefore, any oral agreement to assign the contract to Albany Co. was invalid.
The Board highlighted the fact that the petitioner guaranteed the account of Albany Co., which further supported the view that Albany Co. was a purchaser from Amoco through the petitioner, not a selling agent for Amoco.
The Board explicitly stated, "We are of the opinion and so hold that in making the contract with Amoco of August 1, 1935, and in doing all things in the performance thereof, the petitioner was acting in his individual capacity and not as the agent of the Albany Co."

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that income is taxed to the individual who earns it, and that attempts to redirect income to another entity will not necessarily shift the tax burden, particularly when a clear contractual relationship exists.
It highlights the importance of adhering to contractual terms regarding assignment or modification. An express clause requiring written consent must be strictly followed to ensure a valid transfer of rights or obligations.
This case serves as a reminder that courts will look beyond the stated intentions of parties and examine the substance of the transactions, including the terms of the contract and the conduct of the parties, to determine who is the true earner of income.
This decision is frequently cited in cases involving assignment of income and the determination of who is the proper taxpayer.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.