Proskey v. Commissioner, 51 T. C. 918 (1969)

Stipends received by resident physicians from hospitals are taxable as compensation if they are primarily for services rendered, not as nontaxable fellowship grants.

Summary

Aloysius J. Proskey, a resident physician at University Hospital, claimed a portion of his 1965 stipend was a nontaxable fellowship grant under IRC section 117. The Tax Court ruled against him, holding that his stipend was taxable compensation because it was payment for services rendered, not aid for study or research. Additionally, even if classified as a fellowship grant, the stipend would still be taxable due to the 36-month exclusion limit. This decision clarifies that stipends paid to residents for their work in hospitals are generally taxable income, not excludable grants.

Facts

Aloysius J. Proskey was a resident physician at University Hospital, University of Michigan, from August 1962 to June 1967. In 1965, he received a stipend of $5,170. 02, which he reported as wages but excluded $3,600 as a fellowship grant under IRC section 117. The hospital, handling 22,000 inpatients and 250,000 outpatients annually, relied on residents like Proskey for patient care. Proskey's duties included diagnosing and treating patients, supervising interns, and performing administrative tasks. The stipend amount was based on his years of service, not financial need, and was treated as compensation by the hospital, with taxes withheld and benefits provided.

Procedural History

Proskey filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the Commissioner's determination of a $748. 43 deficiency in his 1965 income tax. The Commissioner argued that Proskey's stipend was taxable compensation under IRC section 61. The Tax Court sustained the Commissioner's determination, ruling that the stipend was not a fellowship grant and, even if it were, the 36-month exclusion limit applied.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $5,170. 02 stipend received by Proskey in 1965 from University Hospital constitutes a fellowship grant under IRC section 117(a)(1)(B), or compensation for services rendered, taxable under IRC section 61.
2. If the stipend is a fellowship grant, whether an exclusion is disallowed by the 36-month limitation in IRC section 117(b)(2)(B).

Holding

1. No, because the stipend was compensation for services rendered to the hospital, not aid for study or research.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because even if the stipend were a fellowship grant, Proskey had received similar payments for more than 36 months prior to 1965, precluding any exclusion under IRC section 117(b)(2)(B).

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the definition of a fellowship grant from the regulations, which requires the payment to aid the recipient in study or research. Proskey's stipend was not a fellowship grant because it was compensation for services essential to the hospital's operation. The court considered the nature of the hospital, the extensive services required of residents, and the financial arrangements, including the stipend's dependence on years of service and the provision of employment benefits like vacation and retirement plans. The court also noted that the hospital treated the stipend as wages by withholding taxes and designating payments as such. Even if the stipend were a fellowship grant, the 36-month limitation in IRC section 117(b)(2)(B) applied, as Proskey had received similar payments for over 36 months before 1965. The court rejected Proskey's argument that the limitation did not apply because he had not previously claimed the exclusion, citing clear regulatory language that the limitation applies regardless of prior claims.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how resident physicians and hospitals should treat stipends for tax purposes. Hospitals and residents must recognize that stipends for services rendered are taxable compensation, not excludable fellowship grants. This ruling guides legal practice by clarifying the distinction between compensation and grants in the medical training context. It also affects hospitals' financial planning, as they must account for the tax implications of resident stipends. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the principle that payments for services, even in educational settings, are generally taxable. This case is significant in distinguishing taxable income from nontaxable grants in the context of medical residencies.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.