22 T.C. 493 (1954)

An individual can be considered a bona fide resident of a foreign country for the purpose of tax exemption under section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, even if their family does not accompany them due to circumstances beyond their control, such as housing shortages.

Summary

In 1949, Fred H. Pierce worked as an accountant in Iceland for Lockheed Aircraft Overseas Corporation. He earned $7,350 from sources outside the United States. Pierce sought to exclude this income from his U.S. taxes under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, which exempted income earned by a U.S. citizen who was a bona fide resident of a foreign country for an entire taxable year. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the exemption, arguing Pierce was not a bona fide resident of Iceland. The Tax Court, however, sided with Pierce, finding that he was a bona fide resident of Iceland despite his wife remaining in the United States due to a housing shortage. The court distinguished this case from prior precedents where the taxpayer's intent to reside abroad was less clear.

Facts

Fred H. Pierce, a U.S. citizen, worked as a chief accountant for Lockheed Aircraft Overseas Corporation at Keflavik Airport in Iceland from December 1948 to January 1950. He filed his 1949 tax return excluding the income earned in Iceland, claiming the exemption under Section 116(a). His wife did not accompany him to Iceland because of a housing shortage, though he intended for her to join him and actively sought housing. Pierce's employment contract stated he would give exclusive attention to the diligent and faithful performance of his duties. He lived in a Quonset hut provided by Lockheed while working in Iceland.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a tax deficiency, disallowing the claimed exclusion. Pierce contested this determination in the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court, after reviewing the facts and applicable law, ruled in favor of Pierce, concluding that he was a bona fide resident of Iceland during 1949. The Commissioner's determination was reversed.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayer was a bona fide resident of Iceland throughout the taxable year 1949.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found that Pierce was a bona fide resident of Iceland

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

during 1949 despite his wife not residing with him due to housing limitations.

Court's Reasoning

The court considered whether Pierce met the requirements for the exemption under Section 116(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. The key issue was whether Pierce was a bona fide resident of Iceland. The court acknowledged that the determination of residency is primarily a question of fact and that, as stated in Charles F. Bouldin, 8 T.C. 959, the court must determine if the taxpayer was "a bona fide resident of a foreign country during the entire taxable year." The court distinguished the facts of this case from those in *Michael Downs, 7 T.C. 1053*, where the taxpayer's connection to the foreign country was less substantial. Pierce's situation, where the unavailability of family housing prevented his wife from joining him, did not negate his bona fide residency. The court found no indication that the petitioner intended to remain a transient or sojourner, as defined in the regulations. The court cited *Seeley v. Commissioner, 186 F.2d 541*, in which the court stated, "Certainly it would not further the general purpose of the statute to induce Americans to take jobs abroad, if those were granted tax exemption who could take their wives, but those were not, who could not." The court determined that Pierce was not a transient, he intended to reside in Iceland, and the circumstances prevented him from establishing a home for his family. The court ultimately concluded that Pierce had been a bona fide resident of Iceland for the entire year of 1949, thus entitling him to the exemption under the statute.

Practical Implications

This case is significant for attorneys dealing with tax issues related to overseas employment. It emphasizes the importance of demonstrating a clear intent to reside in a foreign country, even when circumstances, like housing issues, prevent the taxpayer's family from joining them. It implies that factors beyond the taxpayer's control, that hinder establishing a permanent home, do not necessarily disqualify an individual from being considered a bona fide resident. The case highlights the need for a fact-specific analysis and the application of specific statutory provisions. This decision underscores the flexibility in interpreting the meaning of "bona fide resident" when assessing intent and evaluating the specific circumstances of the taxpayer's situation. Attorneys must carefully document the taxpayer's intent, the nature of the employment, and any obstacles faced in establishing a home abroad. The case serves as an important precedent for tax cases with similar factual scenarios and provides a valuable distinction from cases with weaker evidence of an intent to reside in a foreign country.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.