***Freudmann v. Commissioner, 10 T.C. 11 (1948)***

Income is taxed based on an individual's residency status at the time the income is actually or constructively received, not when the services that generated the income were performed.

**Summary**

The Tax Court held that a bonus payment received by the petitioner from Duys & Co., Inc., was taxable as income because it was received after the petitioner became a resident alien of the United States. The petitioner argued that the bonus was earned while he was a nonresident alien and therefore exempt from U.S. taxation. The court determined that the right to the bonus, and thus the income, did not accrue until the amount was definitively calculated, which occurred after he became a resident alien. Therefore, the income was taxable.

**Facts**

Prior to March 8, 1941, the petitioner was a Dutch citizen and a nonresident alien of the United States. He worked for Duys & Co., Inc., under an agreement where he received a salary and a commission on tobacco purchases he made. In August 1940, a new contract was executed, granting him a bonus of 25% of the net proceeds from tobacco purchased by him. The amount of the bonus was to be determined after Duys closed its books on March 31, 1941. The petitioner became a resident alien on March 8, 1941. He received a bonus payment of $56,211.21 from Duys in 1941.

**Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue included the $56,211.21 bonus in the petitioner's taxable income for 1941. The petitioner contested this inclusion, arguing that the income was earned while he was a nonresident alien and thus exempt. The Tax Court heard the case to determine whether the bonus was taxable.

**Issue(s)**

Whether the $56,211.21 bonus payment received by the petitioner in 1941 is taxable as income, given that he became a resident alien prior to the date the bonus amount was definitively determined and paid.

**Holding**

Yes, because the definite amount of the bonus, and thus the income to the petitioner, could not have been determined before March 31, 1941, at which time he was a resident alien and subject to taxation as such.

**Court's Reasoning**

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

The Tax Court focused on when the $56,211.21 became income to the petitioner. The court reasoned that prior to the August 1940 contract, the petitioner only had rights to his salary and commission, which were exempt from U.S. taxation. The new contract created a bonus system based on 25% of the net proceeds realized by Duys on the tobacco the petitioner purchased. The amount of the bonus was contingent upon the net proceeds calculated after the close of Duys' books on March 31, 1941. The court emphasized that the amount of the bonus was not fixed or determinable until that date. As the court stated, "It is too patent for extended discussion that the definite amount of the bonus, and hence the income to the petitioner, could not have been determined before that date." The court also noted that the petitioner kept his books and filed his tax returns on a cash basis. The court pointed to bookkeeping entries showing the bonus was credited to the petitioner on March 31, 1941, further supporting the conclusion that the income was not available to him until that date. Since he was a resident alien on March 31, 1941, the bonus was taxable income.

**Practical Implications**

This case clarifies that the timing of income recognition, particularly for bonuses or contingent payments, is crucial in determining tax liability, especially for individuals changing residency status. It emphasizes that the right to income must be fixed and determinable for it to be considered taxable. This ruling impacts how companies structure compensation agreements involving bonuses, especially for employees who may be moving to or from the United States. Tax advisors must consider the timing of income recognition to minimize tax liabilities for their clients. The case highlights the importance of documenting when the right to income becomes fixed and determinable. Subsequent cases have relied on Freudmann to distinguish between income earned while a non-resident versus income earned while a resident of the US.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 