Simmons v. Commissioner, 17 T.C. 159 (1951)

Retirement pay received by a taxpayer is not exempt from federal income tax under Section 22(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code if the retirement was based solely on age, even if the taxpayer also suffered from a physical disability.

Summary

The petitioner, a former member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, was retired for age. He argued his retirement pay should be exempt from income tax because he also suffered from a physical disability incurred in the line of duty. The Tax Court held that because the official reason for retirement was age, the retirement pay did not constitute compensation for injuries or sickness and was not exempt under Section 22(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court deferred to the Board of Commissioners' discretion in retiring the petitioner for age.

Facts

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia issued an order retiring Simmons from the Fire Department, citing that he had reached the age of 64. The order granted him a monthly allowance from the Policemen's and Firemen's Relief Fund. Simmons argued the retirement was arbitrary because he suffered a physical disability incurred in the line of duty and didn't apply for retirement. The Board later issued an order stating that at the time of retirement, Simmons had a disability that could have justified retirement on those grounds, had he not been retired for age.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the retirement pay Simmons received was taxable income. Simmons petitioned the Tax Court, arguing that the retirement pay was exempt from taxation under Section 22(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, finding that Simmons was officially retired for age, not disability.

Issue(s)

Whether the retirement pay received by the petitioner in the taxable year 1945 is exempt from income taxation under section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code when the petitioner was officially retired for age, despite also suffering from a physical disability.

Holding

No, because the Board of Commissioners officially retired Simmons due to his age, and therefore, the retirement payments did not constitute compensation for injuries or sickness exempt from tax under Section 22(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court deferred to the Board of Commissioners’ authority to retire members of the Fire Department. It cited District of Columbia Code provisions allowing retirement for both disability and age/length of service. Because Simmons was over 65 at the time of his retirement, the Commissioners were within their discretion to retire him for age. The court stated, “The Commissioners of the District, vested by law with the discretion to retire petitioner for age, have exercised that discretion. This Court has no power to re-try the facts or establish a conclusion different from that reached by the Board of Commissioners.” Because the official reason for retirement was age, the court concluded the payments did not constitute compensation for injuries or sickness under Section 22(b)(5). The court cited prior cases such as *Elmer D. Pangburn, 13 T. C. 169* and *Waller v. United States, 180 F. 2d 194* supporting this interpretation.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the importance of the stated reason for retirement in determining the taxability of retirement pay. Even if a retiree suffers from a disability, if the official basis for retirement is age or length of service, the retirement pay is likely to be considered taxable income, not an excludable benefit for injury or sickness. Legal practitioners should advise clients to carefully document the basis for retirement, especially when disability is a contributing factor. Subsequent cases would likely distinguish this ruling if the official reason for retirement was disability, even with age as a secondary consideration. The case highlights the limited scope of judicial review over administrative decisions when those decisions are within the agency’s delegated authority.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.