8 T.C. 388 (1947)

An employee realizes taxable income when they purchase stock from their employer at a bargain price, where the difference between the market price and the purchase price is considered compensation for services.

Summary

C.A. Van Dusen, an employee of Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, purchased company stock from the president, R.H. Fleet, at a price below fair market value, pursuant to an option agreement tied to his employment. The IRS determined that the difference between the market value and the purchase price constituted taxable income. The Tax Court agreed with the IRS, holding that the bargain purchase was compensatory in nature and therefore taxable as income under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. This case clarifies that an economic benefit conferred on an employee as compensation is taxable, regardless of its form.

Facts

- C.A. Van Dusen was employed by Consolidated Aircraft Corporation as factory manager.
- R.H. Fleet, the president of Consolidated, granted Van Dusen an option to purchase 50 shares of Fleet's personal stock in the corporation each month at $5 per share for ten years, contingent on Van Dusen's continued employment.
- Van Dusen purchased shares at $5 when the market value was significantly higher.
- Fleet did not deduct the difference between the market value and the sale price as compensation expense, but reported the difference between his basis and the $5/share as capital gain.
- Consolidated only deducted Van Dusen's salary.

Procedural History

- The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Van Dusen's income tax for the years 1938-1941, based on the bargain stock purchases.
- Van Dusen petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies.
- The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, finding the bargain purchase constituted taxable income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the difference between the fair market value of the stock and the price paid by Van Dusen constituted taxable income under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the stock option was granted to Van Dusen as compensation for services rendered and to be rendered, making the difference between the fair market value and the purchase price taxable income.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code defines income broadly, encompassing any economic or financial benefit conferred on an employee as compensation. The court relied on *Commissioner v. Smith, 324 U.S. 177*, stating "Section 22(a) of the Revenue Act is broad enough to include in taxable income any economic or financial benefit conferred on the employee as compensation, *whatever the form or mode by which it is effected*." The court found that the option was granted to induce Van Dusen to join and remain with Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, and the ability to purchase stock at a discount was directly linked to his employment. The benefit was not a gift; it was consideration for his services. Therefore, the economic benefit derived from the bargain purchase was taxable income.

Practical Implications

This case establishes a clear precedent that bargain stock purchases by employees can be considered taxable income if they are compensatory in nature. Attorneys advising employers should counsel them on properly structuring stock option plans to avoid unintended tax consequences for employees. Employers should clearly document whether stock options are intended as compensation or as a means for employees to acquire an ownership stake. Subsequent cases have built upon this principle, further refining the criteria for determining when a stock option constitutes compensation. This ruling has significant implications for executive compensation and the design of employee benefit programs.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.