28 T.C. 36 (1957)

Payments received by an employee under a company-sponsored disability retirement plan are excludable from gross income as amounts received through health insurance, even if the plan also includes retirement benefits based on age and service.

Summary

The United States Tax Court addressed whether disability retirement payments received by Charles J. Jackson from New York Life Insurance Company were excludable from gross income under Section 22(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which addressed amounts received through accident or health insurance. The Court found in favor of the taxpayer, holding that the payments received under the company's retirement and death benefit plan, specifically the disability retirement provisions, qualified as health insurance proceeds and were thus not taxable. The Court emphasized that the plan, though encompassing various benefits, contained a distinct provision for disability retirement, and the payments made under that provision were analogous to health insurance benefits.

Facts

Charles J. Jackson was employed by New York Life Insurance Company from 1908 to 1950. During his employment, the company established a retirement and death benefit plan. The plan included provisions for old age retirement, death benefits, and disability retirement. Jackson retired in 1950 due to permanent and total non-occupational disability and began receiving payments in 1952 under the disability retirement section of the plan. The amount of the payments was calculated based on his salary and years of service, with no contributions from the employees. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that these payments were taxable income, which Jackson disputed.

Procedural History

The case was brought before the United States Tax Court. The parties stipulated to all facts. The court's decision, issued on April 15, 1957, sided with the taxpayer, finding that the disability retirement payments were excludable from gross income.

Issue(s)

Whether payments received by the taxpayer under the disability retirement provisions of his former employer's retirement plan constituted amounts received through health insurance within the meaning of Section 22(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, and thus excludable from gross income?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Yes, because the Court held that the amounts received by the taxpayer pursuant to the disability retirement provisions of the plan were excludible from gross income.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied heavily on the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Haynes v. United States*, which addressed a similar issue involving disability payments. Although there were some factual differences, the Tax Court found the core issue to be the same. The Court found the disability retirement plan to function similarly to health insurance. The Court noted that the plan was created by the employer to provide disability benefits to employees. The court recognized the retirement plan as an insurance program. The disability payments were triggered by sickness and were designed to replace lost wages. The court also noted that the plan was approved by the Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York. Because the payments were made under the health insurance plan, and therefore were excludable from gross income under Section 22(b)(5).

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance for determining whether disability payments received under an employer's plan are taxable. It established that even if a plan encompasses multiple benefits, payments made due to disability may be treated as health insurance proceeds, provided that the plan has a distinct disability component. The decision emphasizes the importance of carefully examining the terms of the plan and its primary purpose. Tax advisors and employers should be aware of this precedent when structuring employee benefit plans, especially those including disability benefits. The case also signals that the substance of the payment, not just the form, should be considered. Later cases have continued to interpret Section 104(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (the successor to Section 22(b)(5)) in line with this precedent, looking at the nature of the payments and the structure of the plan.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.