Jackson v. Commissioner, 25 T.C. 1106 (1956)

When a payment from an employer to a former employee is made due to the employer-employee relationship, it is presumed to be taxable income, not a gift, and the intention of the payor is the crucial factor.

Summary

The case concerns whether a payment of $38,270 to a former employee by the Motion Picture Producers Association constituted a non-taxable gift or taxable income. The court found the payment was taxable income. The court examined the intent of the payor (the Association), the circumstances surrounding the payment (termination of employment, confidentiality agreements, and a general release), and how the payment was characterized and recorded. The court distinguished this situation from a true gift by emphasizing the payment's connection to the former employment relationship and its classification as salary expense.

Facts

The Motion Picture Producers Association paid Jackson, a former employee, $38,270 upon the termination of his employment. Of the total amount, $30,000 was described by the Association as equivalent to his current salary for one year. The additional $8,270 was not explicitly characterized. The payment was conditioned on Jackson entering into an agreement of termination, confidentiality of information, and a general release. The Association charged the payment to salary expense.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined the payment to Jackson was taxable income. The Tax Court reviewed the determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payment of $38,270 from the Motion Picture Producers Association to Jackson constituted a gift under Section 22(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Holding

1. No, because the payment was made due to the employer-employee relationship and was treated as additional compensation for past services.

Court's Reasoning

The court found the payment was taxable income, not a gift, focusing on the payor's intent and surrounding circumstances. The court referenced the Supreme Court's holding in *Commissioner v. Glenshaw Glass Co.*, which mandated a broad

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

interpretation of “gross income” to tax all gains except those specifically exempted. The court stated that “the crucial factor, in determining whether a payment received from a former employer… is a ‘gift’… is the intention with which the payment was made; and such intention must be determined from all facts and surrounding circumstances.”

The court emphasized that, where an employer-employee relationship has existed, the presumption is that payments are compensation for services, not gifts. It noted several factors indicating the absence of a gift: the payment was related to prior salary, was charged as salary expense, and was conditioned on agreements related to the former employment. Furthermore, the court distinguished *Bogardus v. Commissioner*, a case cited by the petitioner, because the recipients in that case had never been employees.

Practical Implications

This case provides important guidance for distinguishing between taxable compensation and non-taxable gifts in the employer-employee context. It underscores the significance of the payor’s intent, determined from all circumstances. When advising clients on payments to former employees, practitioners must carefully examine the nature of the payment, the surrounding agreements, and the accounting treatment. Payments structured and recorded as compensation, especially when related to the past services, will likely be treated as taxable. This case highlights that the presumption favors the payment being taxable income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.