Glackner v. Commissioner, 1948 Tax Ct. Memo LEXIS 235 (1948)

To qualify for a tax exemption under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code for income earned abroad, a U.S. citizen must demonstrate bona fide residency in a foreign country, considering factors like the length of stay, nature of employment, intent, and connections to the foreign country.

Summary

The petitioner, a geophysical exploration employee, sought a tax exemption on income earned in Colombia, claiming bona fide residency. The Tax Court held that he was indeed a resident of Colombia during the taxable years. The court considered the length of his employment abroad (almost ten years), his three-year contract in Colombia, payment of Colombian income taxes, and the nature of his work requiring him to live and work in Colombia for extended periods. The court distinguished this case from others involving temporary absences from the United States.

Facts

The petitioner worked for a company conducting geophysical explorations globally since 1936. He had assignments in Arabia, the Persian Gulf, Sumatra, Colombia, and the United States. In 1941, he entered into a three-year contract to work in Colombia and remained there somewhat longer, returning in 1945. Income taxes were paid to Colombia on his behalf. He was subject to the U.S. Selective Service draft, but his company obtained deferments based on his essential oil development work. His work required constant travel within Colombia. He was unmarried and learned both Arabian and Spanish. He intended to continue working abroad.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against the petitioner for income taxes. The petitioner contested this assessment in the Tax Court, arguing that he was exempt from U.S. income tax on income earned while a bona fide resident of Colombia.

Issue(s)

Whether the petitioner, a U.S. citizen working abroad for an extended period, was a bona fide resident of Colombia during the taxable year, thus qualifying for an exemption from U.S. income tax under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

Yes, because the petitioner’s long-term employment abroad, his extended stay in Colombia under contract, his payment of Colombian income taxes, and the nature of his work demonstrated that he had established bona fide residency in Colombia.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court emphasized that the 1942 amendment to Section 116(a) required affirmative proof of foreign residency, a stricter standard than mere non-residency in the United States. The court considered the totality of the circumstances, including the length and nature of the petitioner’s employment, his intent to remain in Colombia for a significant period (three years), and the fact that he paid income taxes to Colombia. The court distinguished this case from those involving temporary absences from the U.S. by individuals whose primary residence and career were in the U.S., stating, “…here we consider a man whose career is that of foreign service with a company…actually abroad from November 1938 until February 1945… Plainly, his position is broadly different from one who had a home, a wife, and children residing in the United States.” The court found his deferment from military service, while potentially indefinite, did not negate his intent to remain in Colombia, and his lack of participation in Colombian social life was understandable given his work and contractual restrictions.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the factors considered when determining bona fide residency for tax exemption purposes under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. It highlights the importance of demonstrating a long-term connection to the foreign country, including the length and nature of employment, intent to remain, and payment of foreign taxes. This ruling informs how similar cases should be analyzed by emphasizing a holistic approach to assessing residency, considering all relevant facts and circumstances. It is significant for legal practitioners advising U.S. citizens working abroad, providing a framework for evaluating their eligibility for the foreign earned income exclusion. Later cases cite it as precedent for analyzing foreign residency claims.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.