24 T.C. 174 (1955)

Income derived from the sale of agricultural products grown on restricted Indian lands is subject to federal income tax if there is no explicit congressional grant of exemption.

Summary

The case involved an American Indian, a member of the Kalispel Tribe, who received income from selling grain grown on restricted lands within the Coeur d'Alene Reservation. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency, including the grain sale income in taxable income. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that the income was taxable because the petitioner, as a U.S. citizen, was subject to federal income tax on income from the grain sales, and there was no specific exemption provided by Congress or treaty. The Court distinguished this from cases involving the sale of the land's corpus.

Facts

Joseph R. Garry, an enrolled member of the Kalispel Tribe and a U.S. citizen, received income from the sale of grain grown on lands within the Coeur d'Alene Reservation. These lands were held in trust by the United States for the benefit of Garry and other heirs of the original Indian allottees. Garry claimed the income was exempt from federal income tax. The Coeur d'Alene Reservation was established by agreements with the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, ratified by Congress.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a tax deficiency, including the income from grain sales in Garry's taxable income. Garry petitioned the U.S. Tax Court, disputing the tax assessment. The Tax Court reviewed the facts, legal arguments, and applicable precedents, and issued a decision in favor of the Commissioner, deciding the case under Rule 50.

Issue(s)

1. Whether income received from the sale of grain grown on allotted Indian lands within the Coeur d'Alene Reservation is subject to federal income tax.

Holding

1. Yes, because absent a specific Congressional grant of tax exemption, the income is subject to federal income tax.

Court's Reasoning

The court found that the petitioner, as a U.S. citizen, was generally subject to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

federal income tax. The court distinguished this situation from cases involving the sale of land or the extraction of resources from the land's corpus, where the capital itself was subject to tax exemption. The court referenced Cook v. Tait, which established the power to tax a U.S. citizen's income from foreign sources. The court considered and rejected arguments based on the General Allotment Act and the case of Capoeman v. United States, finding them not applicable because the case did not deal with the taxation of the land's corpus. It also distinguished the precedent cited by the petitioner which the Supreme Court had already overturned. The court emphasized that the general terms of the income tax laws applied unless a specific exemption existed and derived from an act of Congress or an agreement.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that income from agricultural activities on restricted Indian lands is taxable unless Congress has explicitly granted an exemption. It underscores the importance of specific statutory or treaty provisions in determining tax liability. It serves as a precedent for distinguishing between income generated from the land's produce (taxable) and income realized from the sale or exploitation of the land itself (potentially exempt). It is essential for legal practitioners to thoroughly examine relevant treaties, statutes, and case law to determine the taxability of income derived from activities on restricted lands. Taxpayers must show a clear basis for exemption.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.