19 T.C. 461 (1952)

An employee who receives a lump-sum distribution from a pension trust but continues to work for the same employer at the same salary has not experienced a ‘separation from service’ as defined by Section 165(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, and therefore is not entitled to capital gains treatment on the distribution.

Summary

Frank B. Fry received a lump-sum distribution from his employer’s pension trust in 1947, which he reported as a capital gain. However, he continued to work for the same employer at his regular salary until his death in 1949. The Tax Court held that Fry’s continued employment meant he had not ‘separated from service’ under Section 165(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, so the distribution was taxable as ordinary income. The court emphasized the lack of a genuine severance of the employment relationship, despite Fry reducing his hours and spending more time away from the company.

Facts

Frank B. Fry owned 50% of H.A. Wilson Company and worked there in an executive capacity.

The H.A. Wilson Company had a pension plan for employees, including Fry.

In 1947, Fry certified he reached retirement age, received $65,481.50 from the pension trust, and released the trust from all claims.

Fry reported half of this distribution as a capital gain on his 1947 tax return.

Despite receiving the distribution, Fry continued to work for H.A. Wilson Company and received his regular salary of $36,500 per year until his death in 1949.

Fry spent less time at the company and more time at his vacation homes but remained an employee.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Fry’s 1947 income tax due to the capital gains treatment of the pension distribution.

Fry’s estate, represented by his administrator, Frederick E. Fry, petitioned the Tax Court for a review of the Commissioner’s determination.

Issue(s)

Whether Frank B. Fry experienced a ‘separation from the service’ of his employer in 1947, as that term is used in Section 165(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, such that

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the lump-sum distribution from the pension trust should be taxed as a capital gain rather than ordinary income.

Holding

No, because Frank B. Fry continued to be employed by the H.A. Wilson Company at his regular salary after receiving the lump-sum distribution; therefore, he did not experience a 'separation from service' within the meaning of Section 165(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the language 'on account of the employee's separation from the service' in Section 165(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The court noted that Fry continued to receive his regular salary of $36,500 per year after receiving the lump-sum distribution, which strongly suggested he had not severed his connection with his employer.

The court referenced the Senate Finance Committee Report No. 1631, which clarified that the capital gains treatment applies when an employee 'retires or severs his connection with his employer.'

The court found that Fry's continued employment, despite reduced hours, indicated he had not genuinely severed his connection with H.A. Wilson Company.

The court dismissed the petitioner's argument that Fry had retired, stating that the continued receipt of his full salary contradicted this claim. The court found the attorney's explanation of "a mistake, I imagine" unconvincing.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that a mere reduction in work hours or responsibilities is insufficient to constitute a 'separation from service' if the employee continues to receive a regular salary from the same employer.

Legal practitioners must carefully examine the employment relationship to determine if a genuine severance has occurred, considering factors such as continued salary payments, ongoing employment contracts, and the nature of the services rendered.

Taxpayers seeking capital gains treatment on pension distributions must demonstrate a complete termination of the employment relationship, not merely a change in work arrangements.

Later cases applying this ruling would likely scrutinize the financial arrangements between the employer and employee, focusing on whether the employee continues

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to receive compensation that resembles a regular salary.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.