Erie Resistor Corporation v. Commissioner, 19 T.C. 473 (1952)

Section 23(p) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended in 1942, is the exclusive section under which contributions to an employee pension fund or payments deferring compensation are deductible; such contributions are not deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) if they fail to meet the requirements of Section 23(p).

Summary

Erie Resistor Corporation contributed to an employee benefit fund and sought to deduct these contributions as ordinary and necessary business expenses. The Tax Court held that Section 23(p) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1942, provides the exclusive means for deducting contributions to employee pension funds or deferred compensation plans. Because Erie Resistor's contributions did not meet the requirements of Section 23(p) relating to non-forfeitable employee rights, the deduction was disallowed. The court emphasized Congress's intent to create a specific and exclusive framework for these deductions to prevent abuse.

Facts

Erie Resistor Corporation made contributions to the Erie Times Employees Benefit and Pension Fund in 1944 and 1945. This fund was established by the employees, not by Erie Resistor itself. The company's contributions to the fund were not guaranteed. Employees' rights to the fund were forfeitable under certain conditions, such as death, termination of employment, or failure to make payments prior to April 3, 1948, or before completing 20 years of service. The company attempted to deduct these contributions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction claimed by Erie Resistor Corporation. Erie Resistor then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court reviewed the case to determine the deductibility of the contributions under the relevant provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Section 23(p) of the Internal Revenue Code is the exclusive section under which contributions to an employee pension fund or payments deferring compensation can be deducted.
2. Whether Erie Resistor's contributions to the Erie Times Employees Benefit and Pension Fund were deductible under Section 23(a)(1)(A) as ordinary and necessary business expenses, even if they did not meet the requirements of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 23(p).

Holding

1. Yes, Section 23(p) is the exclusive section under which contributions to an employee pension fund or payments deferring compensation are deductible because Congress intended it to be the sole avenue for such deductions to prevent abuse and ensure consistent treatment.
2. No, Erie Resistor's contributions were not deductible under Section 23(a)(1)(A) because Section 23(p) is the exclusive provision governing such deductions, and the contributions did not meet Section 23(p)'s requirements, specifically the requirement that employees' rights be non-forfeitable.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that while deductions from gross income are a matter of legislative grace, Section 23(p) specifically addresses deductions for contributions to employee pension funds and deferred compensation plans. The court emphasized that the Erie Times Employees Benefit and Pension Fund did not qualify as an exempt trust under Section 165(a) because it was established by the employees, not the employer. Furthermore, employees' rights to the contributions were forfeitable, failing to meet the requirements of Section 23(p)(1)(D). The court also highlighted the legislative history of Section 23(p), as amended by the Revenue Act of 1942, which demonstrated Congress's intent to make Section 23(p) the exclusive avenue for deducting such contributions. The court quoted Tavannes Watch Co. v. Commissioner, stating that the 1942 amendments forbade any deduction for payments made to employees' profit-sharing funds except in accordance with Section 23(p).

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that contributions to employee benefit plans or deferred compensation arrangements must meet the specific requirements of Section 23(p) of the Internal Revenue Code to be deductible. It emphasizes the importance of structuring such plans to ensure that employees' rights are non-forfeitable to qualify for a deduction. This decision has significant implications for employers seeking to deduct contributions to employee benefit funds. It underscores the need to comply strictly with the provisions of Section 23(p) and highlights the importance of plan design and employee rights. Later cases have relied on this decision to reinforce the exclusivity of Section 23(p) in governing deductions for contributions to employee benefit plans and deferred compensation arrangements. This case remains relevant for tax practitioners advising businesses on employee benefits and compensation strategies.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.