17 T.C. 137 (1951)

An employer's contributions to a valid employee pension trust are deductible for income tax purposes, and the "normal cost" of a pension plan is determined actuarially without reducing it by any surplus funds from prior years.

Summary

The Lincoln Electric Co. sought to deduct contributions made to its employee annuity plan. The IRS argued that the payments did not qualify as trust contributions under Section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code and that the "normal cost" should be reduced by surplus funds. The Tax Court held that the agreement between the company and Equitable created a valid trust and that the normal cost should be actuarially determined without any reduction by any amount.

Facts

Lincoln Electric Co. established a "Contributing Annuity Plan" for its employees and entered into an agreement with Equitable for its administration. The plan covered 98.5% of the company's employees and didn't favor any officer, stockholder, or employee. Both the company and its employees contributed to the plan. When an employee reached retirement age, Equitable would use the funds to purchase an annuity. The company made periodic payments to Equitable and could not divert these payments for purposes outside the plan. From 1934-1941, the company claimed deductions for its payments to Equitable, apportioning each payment over the following ten years. In 1943 and 1944, the company deposited $144,865.44 and $146,478.99 respectively to cover the "normal cost" of the Equitable plan.

Procedural History

Lincoln Electric Co. claimed deductions on its income tax returns for contributions to its pension plan. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed portions of the deduction, arguing that the surplus in the trust fund should be applied to reduce the amount required for the annuities. The Tax Court was asked to determine the deductibility of the pension plan contributions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the agreement between Lincoln Electric Co. and Equitable created a valid trust under Section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the "normal cost" of the pension plan should be reduced by the surplus in the trust fund when calculating deductible contributions under Section 23(p) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the parties intended to create a fiduciary relationship, not a mere

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

debtor-creditor or simple contractual relationship.
2. No, because the statute and regulations defining “normal cost” do not authorize or permit the adjustment of the actuarially determined figure of “normal cost” by any amount.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that a trust was created because Equitable received payments for the specific purpose of providing pensions to the company’s employees, and Equitable was bound to keep the funds intact for their benefit. The payments constituted a trust res. The court dismissed the IRS’s arguments that no trust was created because Equitable paid “interest,” employees couldn’t sue Equitable, Equitable dealt with itself, and it hadn’t been shown that Equitable could act as trustee. The test of whether a trust or debt is created depends on the intention of the parties. Regarding the “normal cost” issue, the court stated that the statute does not define “normal cost,” but the term should be given its ordinary meaning. “Normal cost” for any year means the amount of money charged or required to be paid normally to meet its liability under the contract for annuities arising from services in such year. The court referenced Regulations 111, section 29.23 (p)-7, which defines “normal cost” as “the amount actuarially determined which would be required as a contribution by the employer in such year to maintain the plan if the plan had been in effect from the beginning of service of each then included employee.”

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the requirements for establishing a valid employee pension trust for tax deduction purposes. It confirms that the “normal cost” of a pension plan, which is a key element in calculating deductible contributions, should be actuarially determined without reducing it by surplus funds from prior years. This provides clarity for employers seeking to deduct pension plan contributions, as they can rely on actuarial calculations without fear of arbitrary adjustments based on past surpluses. This case also emphasizes the importance of clear documentation and communication with employees regarding the terms and operation of the plan. Subsequent cases and IRS rulings have continued to refine the rules around pension plan deductions, but this case remains a significant precedent for understanding the basic principles.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.