25 T.C. 1255 (1956)

The value of lodging provided by an employer as compensation for services rendered is taxable income, regardless of whether the lodging also benefits the employer.

Summary

In *Dietz v. Commissioner*, the U.S. Tax Court addressed whether the value of an apartment provided to janitors by their employer was taxable income. The Dietzes, who performed janitorial services in exchange for rent-free lodging, argued that the lodging was for the convenience of the employer and therefore not taxable. The court found that because the lodging was provided as compensation for services, its value was taxable income, irrespective of any benefit to the employer. The court distinguished between situations where lodging is primarily compensatory and those where it is furnished solely for the employer's convenience, emphasizing the compensatory nature of the arrangement in this case.

Facts

Leslie and Rosalie Dietz entered into an agreement with Dick and Reuteman Company to perform janitorial services in an apartment building. In return, they were allowed to occupy an apartment in the building rent-free. The Dietzes performed various duties, including boiler operation, repairs, and general maintenance. They also had to be available at any time. The fair market value of their apartment use was $62.50 per month. The Dietzes received $15 in cash from the employer, and otherwise, the free apartment was their only compensation for services.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the Dietzes' income tax for 1951, asserting that the value of the rent-free apartment was taxable income. The Dietzes challenged this determination in the U.S. Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the value of an apartment furnished to the Dietzes by their employer as compensation for services is includible in their gross income?

Holding

Yes, because the apartment was furnished as compensation for services, its value is includible in the Dietzes' gross income.

Court's Reasoning

The court referenced 26 U.S.C. § 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

defines gross income as including compensation for personal service. The court also examined Regulations 111, § 29.22(a)-3, which addresses compensation paid other than in cash, including the value of living quarters. The court cited prior cases, such as *Joseph L. Doran* and *Charles A. Brasher*, to clarify the distinction between lodging furnished as compensation and lodging provided for the employer's convenience. The court stated that if the lodging is compensatory, it is includible in gross income, even if it also benefits the employer. The court emphasized that the apartment was provided to the Dietzes as the sole consideration for their services, thus making its value taxable income.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that the primary purpose behind furnishing lodging is crucial for determining taxability. If lodging is provided as a form of compensation, its value is taxable, even if the arrangement also benefits the employer. This principle is important in employment law where employers often provide housing, such as for resident managers, caretakers, or employees in remote locations. The ruling requires careful consideration of the economic substance of the arrangement. It also underscores that the "convenience of the employer" rule is not a blanket exemption but a factor. Later cases continue to apply this distinction, focusing on the intent of the lodging arrangement and the nature of the consideration exchanged.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.