Audio v. Commissioner, 1947 Tax Ct. Memo LEXIS 96 (1947)

A U.S. citizen working on a U.S. military base in a foreign country, under the exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. government and exempt from foreign taxes, is not a bona fide resident of that foreign country for the purposes of claiming an exemption on income earned abroad under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

The petitioner, a U.S. citizen, worked in Greenland for a U.S. Army contractor in 1943. He sought an exemption from U.S. income tax on the basis that he was a bona fide resident of Greenland for the entire tax year. The Tax Court denied the exemption, holding that because the U.S. had exclusive jurisdiction over the defense areas where the petitioner worked, and the petitioner was exempt from Danish taxes, he could not be considered a bona fide resident of Greenland under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended. The court emphasized that the intent of Congress was to prevent unjust duplication of taxes, not to provide a tax haven for U.S. citizens working abroad but still under U.S. jurisdiction.

Facts

- The petitioner was a U.S. citizen.
- He worked in Greenland for a U.S. Army contractor during 1943, constructing military bases.
- His work was within areas under the exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. government, according to a defense agreement with Denmark.
- He was exempt from all forms of taxation by Danish authorities in Greenland.
- His employment contracts stipulated payment in New York and were subject to New York laws.
- He secured transportation back to Duluth, Minnesota, his original home.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the petitioner’s income tax for 1943. The petitioner contested this determination in the Tax Court, arguing that his income earned in Greenland was exempt from U.S. income tax under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner’s determination and ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether a U.S. citizen working in Greenland on a U.S. military base, under the exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. government and exempt from Greenlandic taxes, is a bona fide resident of Greenland for the purpose of excluding income earned in Greenland from U.S. gross income under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Section 148(a) of the Revenue Act of 1942.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

No, because the petitioner, working on a U.S. military base under U.S. jurisdiction and exempt from Danish taxes, did not establish a bona fide residence in Greenland within the meaning and intent of Section 116(a) as amended. The court found that the purpose of the statute was to prevent double taxation, not to provide a tax exemption where no foreign tax liability existed.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the legislative history of Section 116(a) indicated Congress intended to relieve hardship for U.S. citizens genuinely subject to foreign income taxes. Because the U.S. had exclusive jurisdiction over the defense areas in Greenland and the petitioner was exempt from Danish taxes, he was not subject to the hardship Congress sought to address. The court cited the "Agreement Relating to the Defense of Greenland," which granted the U.S. exclusive jurisdiction and exempted U.S. personnel from Danish taxes. The court stated, "Indeed, the expression, 'the Government of the United States of America shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any such defense area in Greenland and over military and civilian personnel of the United States * * * within such areas,' constitutes reservation of jurisdiction under the general income tax law of the United States…" The court also noted that the petitioner's intent was to work temporarily until discharged or until he wished to quit, and he maintained ties to his home in Duluth, Minnesota, further undermining his claim of bona fide residency in Greenland. Additionally, the Court emphasized that exemptions from taxation are not based on inference. The petitioner had the burden to show he was in the position of suffering the hardship the Senate Committee on Finance had in mind when speaking of those subject to income tax abroad.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the requirements for establishing bona fide foreign residence for U.S. tax purposes, particularly when U.S. citizens are working in foreign countries under the protection and jurisdiction of the U.S. government. It emphasizes that physical presence alone is insufficient; the taxpayer must demonstrate genuine integration into the foreign country's economic and social life, including being subject to its tax laws. This ruling limits the application of Section 116(a) to situations where U.S. citizens are truly residents of a foreign country, bearing the same tax burdens as other residents. Later cases have cited Audio to emphasize the importance of examining the substance of a taxpayer's connection to a foreign country, not just the form. Legal practitioners must carefully examine the specifics of employment contracts and jurisdictional agreements when advising clients on foreign earned income exclusions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.