Cronin v. Commissioner, 7 T.C. 140 (1946)

Payments received by a widow from a Policemen and Firemen's Relief Fund, to which her deceased husband contributed, are considered taxable income akin to an annuity contract under Section 22(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

The petitioner, the widow of a retired fireman, argued that the monthly payments she received from the Policemen and Firemen's Relief Fund of the District of Columbia were a non-taxable gift or gratuity. The Tax Court disagreed, holding that the payments constituted taxable income. The court reasoned that the statutory plan required the fireman to contribute a percentage of his salary to the fund, entitling him, and subsequently his widow, to benefits. This arrangement was sufficiently similar to an annuity contract, making the payments taxable income, especially since the cost of the annuity had already been recovered based on prior payments.

Facts

The petitioner's husband was a fireman in the District of Columbia. He contributed a portion of his salary to the Policemen and Firemen's Relief Fund. Upon reaching retirement age, he became entitled to receive relief from the fund, up to 50% of his salary at retirement. He died shortly after retirement, and his widow began receiving monthly payments from the fund. The petitioner argued that these payments were a gift and therefore not taxable.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the payments received by the petitioner were taxable income. The petitioner challenged this determination in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the payments received by the petitioner from the Policemen and Firemen's Relief Fund constitute taxable income under Section 22(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amounts received pursuant to an annuity contract.

Holding

Yes, because the payments were made from a fund to which the petitioner's deceased husband contributed as an employee, entitling him (and subsequently his widow) to benefits, which is sufficiently akin to an annuity contract to justify similar tax treatment.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court reasoned that the statutory scheme in the District of Columbia Code did not intend to provide gifts or gratuities. Instead, it required employees to contribute to the fund, entitling them to retirement benefits and benefits for their surviving widows and children. The court emphasized that while the Commissioners had discretion over the amount of relief, they could not deny relief entirely. The court found that the benefits were an inducement for employment and contribution to the fund. Because the husband rendered services and contributed to the fund, his widow became entitled to benefits, analogous to an annuity contract. Referencing the Dismuke case, the court stated that this situation was sufficiently akin to an annuity contract and the treatment of retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act to justify a similar treatment. According to the court "Her right to receive was fixed by statute, section 4-507. She did in fact receive monthly payments from the fund, and the situation is sufficiently akin to an annuity contract and the treatment of retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act to justify a similar treatment. See Dismuke case, supra." Because the cost of the annuity was already recovered, the monthly payments constituted taxable income.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that payments from employee-funded retirement or relief funds are generally treated as taxable income, rather than tax-free gifts, even when paid to a beneficiary like a surviving spouse. This ruling reinforces the principle that contributions made during employment, which lead to subsequent benefits, create a taxable event upon distribution. This decision informs how similar benefits plans, especially those with mandatory employee contributions, are structured and taxed. Lawyers advising on employee benefits or estate planning must consider this precedent when evaluating the tax implications of such plans. This case is often cited when determining the taxability of payments from similar retirement or relief funds, particularly when those funds involve contributions from the employee.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.