25 T.C. 16 (1955)

Under Section 107(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, the tax benefits apply to the allocation of compensation included in gross income, and not to reduce the compensation to a net basis by deducting expenses that are reimbursable from the trust and, thus, not expenses of the individual trustee.

Summary

The Estate of W.P. McJunkin contested a tax deficiency assessed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. McJunkin received substantial compensation as a trustee over several years, with a large portion received in 1944. He sought the benefits of Section 107(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which allows for the averaging of income over the period of service when 80% or more of total compensation is received in a single year. McJunkin attempted to reduce his gross compensation by deducting office and other expenses, arguing that this reduced net income, and that 1944 compensation represented more than 80% of his total net income. The Tax Court ruled against McJunkin, holding that Section 107(a) applies to gross income, not net income, and that the claimed expenses were reimbursable advances, and thus not deductible. The court emphasized that, because the trust was solvent, the expenses were not McJunkin's but the trust's, and that the taxpayer could have sought reimbursement under the trust indenture. It further stated that the taxpayer failed to establish the deductibility of the claimed expenses.

Facts

W.P. McJunkin, acting as a trustee, received compensation for his services from 1935 to 1944. In 1944, he received $22,500, a significant portion of his total compensation over the period. The trust indenture allowed trustees to advance funds, either personally or from trust assets, for trust purposes and to be reimbursed for these advances. McJunkin performed trustee duties in the partnership offices of McJunkin, Patton & Co. Office expenses were paid by the partnership and factored into partner profit distributions. McJunkin did not seek direct reimbursement for any expenses. McJunkin claimed, for the year 1944, the benefits of Section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code. In support, he attached a schedule showing the allocation of trust fees to the 10-year period, and offsetting expenses for each year. The Commissioner assessed a deficiency after determining that, even without considering the alleged deductions, 1944 compensation did not constitute at least 80% of his total compensation. The partnership's books were later revised to allocate estimated office expenses to McJunkin. McJunkin then filed amended tax returns for 1942 and 1943, claiming deductions for these allocated expenses, but did not file amended returns for 1944.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the income tax of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

W.P. McJunkin, deceased, for the year 1944. The executor, Fidelity Trust Company, brought the case before the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court considered the issue of whether McJunkin's compensation for 1944 qualified for the benefits of Section 107(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, allowing for averaging income over the period of the services, by reducing the compensation by the amount of business expenses. The Tax Court ruled against McJunkin, thereby upholding the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the compensation received by the decedent for his services as a trustee in 1944, after deducting expenses, constituted at least 80 percent of his total compensation for such services over the period, so as to make the benefits of Section 107 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code available.

Holding

1. No, because the statute provides for allocation of compensation included in the gross income, and because the expenses claimed were not the decedent's but were reimbursable advances.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court rejected McJunkin's attempt to reduce his compensation to a net basis by deducting expenses. First, the court noted that Section 107(a) of the Internal Revenue Code provides for the allocation of compensation included in the "gross income" and does not allow for the deduction of expenses to arrive at a net amount. The court emphasized that McJunkin sought to deduct claimed expenses from gross income which did not conform to the statute. Second, the court stated that, under the trust indenture, McJunkin could have obtained reimbursement from the trust for any expenses he incurred. The court asserted that such expenses represented reimbursable advances, not expenses of the decedent, and therefore were not deductible, citing *Glendinning, McLeish & Co., 24 B.T.A. 518 (1931).* The court highlighted that the trust was solvent and the trustee could have been reimbursed. Finally, even if the expenses were not reimbursable, the court found that the taxpayer failed to establish their deductibility. The court determined that the amounts were estimated and the evidence was insufficient to overcome the Commissioner's challenge to their validity. The court held that the amended accounting was made after the fact to support the taxpayer's case, that the office expenses were paid by the partnership, that there was no similar revision of the partnership accounts for 1944 or other years, and that the expenses were also not consistently accounted for. Therefore, the court found that the amounts claimed as expenses were both unreliable and unproven.

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes that the benefits of Section 107(a) of the Internal Revenue

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Code (and its successors) are only applicable to the allocation of the gross income and not to the net income after the deduction of expenses. The case illustrates the importance of proper record-keeping and documentation, especially for expense reimbursements. Taxpayers seeking to apply income averaging provisions must carefully document all aspects of compensation, including the gross amount received and the nature of any expenses. The Court’s emphasis on the trust indenture and the availability of reimbursement highlights that, in a fiduciary context, the character of the expense matters and that it may not be deductible if the trustee could be reimbursed by the trust. This case would impact how similar cases should be analyzed, especially when the expenses can be considered reimbursable. This case further emphasizes the importance of consistent accounting methods across different tax years and the need for reliable evidence to support expense deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.