Allen v. Commissioner, 42 T. C. 469 (1964)

Bonuses paid to a minor's parent for the minor's services are taxable to the minor under Section 73 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In Allen v. Commissioner, a minor baseball player received a $70,000 signing bonus from the Philadelphia Phillies, with $40,000 directed to his mother. The Tax Court ruled that the entire bonus, including the portion paid to his mother, must be included in the minor's gross income under Section 73 of the Internal Revenue Code. The court found that the payments were made in respect of the minor's services, not as compensation for the mother's actions. This decision clarified that bonuses, even when paid to a parent, are taxable to the minor, preventing income splitting to avoid taxes and ensuring a uniform rule across states.

Facts

Ritchie Allen, an 18-year-old minor, signed a contract with the Philadelphia Phillies in 1960, receiving a $70,000 signing bonus. The contract stipulated that $40,000 of this bonus would be paid to his mother, Era Allen. The Phillies considered the total bonus as payment for Allen's services as a professional baseball player. Era Allen claimed she deserved part of the bonus due to her support in raising him, but there was no evidence of an agreement for her to receive compensation for influencing her son to sign or for her consent.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the entire $70,000 bonus, including the portion paid to Era Allen, should be included in Ritchie Allen's gross income for the tax years 1961-1963. Allen petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination, arguing that the payments to his mother were not taxable to him. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payments made to Era Allen were received in respect of Ritchie Allen's services under Section 73(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the bonus payments to Era Allen could be deducted by Ritchie Allen as an ordinary and necessary business expense.

Holding

1. Yes, because the payments were made solely in respect of Ritchie Allen's services as a professional baseball player, and thus must be included in his gross income under Section 73(a).
2. No, because the payments to Era Allen were not reasonable or necessary business

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

expenses, and thus are not deductible under Section 61.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 73(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, which states that amounts received in respect of the services of a child must be included in the child’s gross income. The court found that the entire $70,000 bonus was paid to obtain Ritchie Allen’s services, with no separate agreement for Era Allen’s compensation. The court rejected the argument that the bonus was not compensation for services because it was paid regardless of services performed, emphasizing that the bonus was paid to secure Allen’s future services and thus was in respect of his services. The court also considered policy reasons for the uniform application of Section 73, preventing income splitting based on state law variations. Regarding the deduction, the court distinguished this case from Hundley, where a father’s services justified a deduction, noting that Era Allen’s involvement did not justify the large payment as a business expense.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how bonuses for minors are treated for tax purposes, ensuring they are taxed to the minor regardless of who receives the payment. It prevents tax avoidance through income splitting and ensures uniformity across states. For legal practice, attorneys must advise clients that bonuses paid to parents for a minor’s services are taxable to the minor, and deductions for such payments are unlikely unless justified by substantial services from the parent. This ruling has been followed in subsequent cases involving minors and their earnings, reinforcing the broad application of Section 73.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.