12 T.C. 648 (1949)

A taxpayer may elect to accept or reject the benefits of Section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code on any or all separate items of income subject to such treatment when computing tax liability.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed how a taxpayer could apply Section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides tax relief for long-term compensation received in one year, when multiple items of income qualified for such treatment. The court held that the taxpayer was not required to apply Section 107 to all eligible income items if doing so would result in a higher tax liability. Instead, the taxpayer could choose which items to apply the provision to in order to minimize their tax burden. This decision clarifies that taxpayers have flexibility in utilizing beneficial tax provisions to their advantage.

Facts

Guy C. Myers received multiple payments in 1941 that qualified for tax treatment under Section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code, which allowed income from services rendered over a long period to be taxed as if it were received over those years. Myers had also sustained an operating loss in 1943, which could be carried back to offset his 1941 income. The Commissioner initially contested the loss carry-back but later conceded. When computing his tax liability, Myers sought to apply Section 107 to only one of the eligible income items, as this approach resulted in a lower overall tax liability due to the loss carry-back.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially ruled that Myers was entitled to the benefits of Section 107 for five specific income items in 1941 (11 T.C. 447). Following this ruling, both Myers and the Commissioner submitted computations under Rule 50 to determine the final tax deficiency. A dispute arose over whether Myers was required to apply Section 107 to all five income items or could choose to apply it to only one. The Tax Court issued a supplemental opinion to resolve this issue.

Issue(s)

Whether a taxpayer, who has received multiple payments in one year that qualify for tax treatment under Section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code, is required to apply Section 107 to all eligible income items, or whether they can choose to apply it to only some if that results in a lower overall tax liability.

Holding

No, because the purpose of Section 107 is to alleviate the hardship of bunching long-

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

term compensation in one year; it does not compel a taxpayer to compute every item of income under its provisions if doing so would result in a greater tax.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 107 was enacted to prevent the hardship of receiving long-term compensation in a single year, allowing taxpayers to be treated as if they received the income over the period the services were rendered. The court emphasized that nothing in the statute compels a taxpayer to apply Section 107 to every eligible income item if it results in a higher tax liability. The court stated, “The only directive contained in section 107 concerning the tax is that… [t]he tax attributable to any part thereof… shall not be greater than the aggregate of the taxes attributable to such part had it been included in the gross income… ratably over that part of the period which precedes the date of such receipt or accrual.” The court found that Myers had “used the only method available to him to get the maximum benefit to which he is entitled under the provisions of section 107.”

Practical Implications

This case provides taxpayers with the flexibility to strategically apply Section 107 to minimize their tax liability when multiple income items qualify for its benefits. Tax advisors should analyze different scenarios to determine which application of Section 107 yields the most favorable tax outcome for their clients. This ruling is particularly relevant when taxpayers have other deductions or losses that can offset income, as demonstrated by Myers’s loss carry-back. Later cases have cited Myers for the principle that remedial tax statutes should be interpreted to benefit the taxpayer, and the taxpayer is allowed to strategically utilize the tax code to minimize liability.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.