17 T.C. 1037 (1951)

A taxpayer cannot deduct compensation expenses deemed unreasonable by the IRS, especially when lacking evidence of the services rendered, nor can the taxpayer recharacterize such disallowed compensation as rent expense without demonstrating the intent to treat it as rent originally.

Summary

Roehl Construction Co. sought to deduct salary payments made to its president, Dorothy Roehl Berry, arguing they were reasonable compensation. The IRS disallowed a portion of the salary deduction, deeming it unreasonable. Roehl Construction then argued that if the salary payments were unreasonable, the excess should be considered additional rent for property leased from Berry. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's disallowance, finding that Roehl Construction failed to provide evidence of the services Berry performed and that there was no indication the payments were intended as rent.

Facts

Roehl Construction Co. was formed in 1942. Dorothy Roehl Berry owned 95% of the company's stock and served as its president. The company rented property from Berry for $100 per month. Roehl Construction also paid Berry a salary, initially set at $200 per month and later raised to $400 per month. The company deducted these salary payments as business expenses. The IRS disallowed a portion of the salary deductions, finding them unreasonable.

Procedural History

Roehl Construction Co. petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies assessed by the IRS. The Tax Court consolidated two dockets related to income tax and excess profits tax liabilities. The primary issue concerned the deductibility of salary payments to the company president and whether disallowed salary could be recharacterized as rental payments. Other issues were either stipulated or abandoned.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the salary payments made to Dorothy Roehl Berry, as president of Roehl Construction Co., were reasonable and deductible as business expenses.
2. If the salary payments were unreasonable, whether the excess could be considered additional rent for the property leased by Roehl Construction Co. from Berry.

Holding

1. No, because Roehl Construction Co. failed to provide evidence of the services

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

rendered by Berry to justify the salary payments.
2. No, because there was no evidence that the parties intended the excess payments to be considered as rent; the payments were consistently treated as salary on the company's books.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized that Roehl Construction Co. presented no evidence regarding the services Berry performed as president. Without such evidence, the court could not determine whether the salary payments were reasonable. The court also rejected the argument that the disallowed salary could be recharacterized as rent. The court stated, "We are not called upon to correct a mistake in the characterizing of an expenditure upon corporate records." It emphasized that the payments were intended as salary and treated as such. The court found no evidence suggesting an intent to pay more than $100 per month for rent. The court distinguished the case from situations where a payment was simply mislabeled, stating, "Petitioner here, however, asks us to disregard the fact and to change the intended character of the expenditure."

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of documenting the services performed by corporate officers to justify salary deductions. Taxpayers must maintain records to support the reasonableness of compensation. It also clarifies that taxpayers cannot easily recharacterize expenses to achieve tax benefits, especially when the initial intent and accounting treatment contradict the proposed recharacterization. Legal practitioners should advise clients to properly document and consistently treat payments to avoid challenges from the IRS. Later cases cite Roehl for the principle that the substance of a transaction, as originally intended and documented, generally controls over attempts to recharacterize it for tax advantages. It highlights the difficulty in retroactively altering the nature of a transaction for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.