6 T.C. 1060 (1946)

Funds placed in an irrevocable trust by an employer for the benefit of an employee are not taxable income to the employee in the year the funds are contributed if the employee's rights to the funds are subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture.

Summary

The Tax Court held that $12,500 paid by an employer into a trust for the benefit of an employee, Robertson, was not taxable income to the employee in 1941. The funds were part of a five-year employment contract and trust agreement, stipulating that if Robertson left his job voluntarily or was discharged for cause, the trust assets would be forfeited and redistributed to other employees. The court reasoned that because Robertson's rights to the funds were contingent on continued employment, he did not have unrestricted control or claim of right to the money in 1941, and therefore it was not taxable income.

Facts

Robertson was a highly valued executive for multiple textile companies controlled by B.V.D. Corporation. To ensure his continued employment, B.V.D. offered Robertson a five-year employment contract and established a trust. The agreement stipulated that B.V.D. would make annual payments of $12,500 to a trust managed by American Trust Co. for Robertson's benefit and his family's future retirement income. The trust was funded to purchase retirement income contracts and other investments. However, the trust agreement also included a forfeiture clause: if Robertson voluntarily left his employment or was terminated for cause before the contract's expiration, his rights to the trust funds would be forfeited, and the assets would be redistributed to other employees' trusts.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Robertson's 1941 income tax, arguing that the $12,500 paid into the trust was taxable income. Robertson challenged this assessment in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the $12,500 paid by the employer into a trust for the employee's benefit in 1941 constituted taxable income to the employee in that year, given the restrictions and forfeiture provisions of the trust agreement.

Holding

No, because the employee's right to receive the agreed economic benefits was restricted due to the condition that he remain employed during the designated term. Failure to meet this condition would nullify any rights or interests he or his family

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

had in the trust fund.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that while the $12,500 was intended as compensation for Robertson’s services, the forfeiture provisions in both the employment contract and the trust agreement prevented it from being considered taxable income in 1941. The court distinguished this case from others where benefits were immediately and unconditionally available to the employee. It emphasized that Robertson’s right to receive the benefits was contingent on his continued employment; ceasing employment voluntarily or being discharged for cause would result in forfeiture of the trust assets. Citing *Schaefer v. Bowers*, the court noted that even if termination was at Robertson’s discretion, his rights were still encumbered by the obligation to remain employed. The court determined that Robertson did not have “untrammelled dominion” over the property because of the limitations placed on it. The court found the doctrine in *North American Oil Consolidated v. Burnet* inapplicable because Robertson did not actually and unconditionally receive the $12,500 in 1941. The distribution to him or his family by the trustee was restricted and depended upon a condition.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates that funds placed in trust for an employee are not automatically considered taxable income in the year they are contributed. The key factor is whether the employee has unrestricted access and control over the funds. The presence of a substantial risk of forfeiture, such as a requirement of continued employment, can defer taxation until the employee’s rights become vested. This case is significant for structuring deferred compensation plans. It underscores the importance of carefully drafting trust agreements to ensure that funds are subject to restrictions that prevent immediate taxation. Later cases distinguish *Robertson* by focusing on the nature and extent of the restrictions placed on the employee’s access to the funds.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.