Caratan v. Commissioner, 52 T. C. 960 (1969)

The fair market value of lodging provided by an employer to an employee is taxable income unless the employee is required to accept it as a condition of employment.

Summary

In Caratan v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that the value of lodging provided to corporate officers and shareholders of M. Caratan, Inc. , a farming corporation, must be included in their gross income. The petitioners, who were also employed in a supervisory capacity, resided in company-owned houses on the farm. The court determined that the lodging was not required as a condition of their employment since alternative housing was available nearby and the petitioners' duties could be performed without living on the premises. The decision hinges on the interpretation of Section 119 of the Internal Revenue Code, which allows an exclusion from gross income for lodging only if it is a necessary condition of employment.

Facts

M. Caratan, Inc. , a California farming corporation, provided company-owned housing to its supervisory and management personnel, including the petitioners who were also shareholders and officers. The petitioners resided in houses on the corporation's farmland, which was near the city of Delano. The houses were provided for the convenience of the employer, and the rental value was $1,200 per year. The petitioners' duties included supervisory roles, and some farm operations occurred at night. Delano, a city with available housing, was within a short distance from the farm, with the nearest residential area being 1. 8 to 6. 2 miles away.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the petitioners' income taxes for the years 1962, 1963, and 1964, including the value of the lodging as additional compensation. The petitioners contested this inclusion, leading to a hearing before the United States Tax Court. The court consolidated the proceedings of the three sets of petitioners and ultimately ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the value of lodging furnished to the petitioners by their employer is excludable from their gross income under Section 119 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioners were not required to accept the lodging as a condition of their employment. The court found that the petitioners could have performed their duties without living on the farm, given the proximity of alternative housing in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Delano.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 119 of the Internal Revenue Code, which requires that lodging be furnished for the convenience of the employer, on the business premises, and as a condition of employment to be excludable from gross income. The Commissioner conceded the first two requirements, so the court focused on whether the lodging was a condition of employment. The court interpreted “required” as meaning necessary for the proper performance of employment duties. The petitioners failed to prove that living on the farm was indispensable to their duties, especially since Delano was nearby and accessible. The court referenced previous cases like Gordon S. Dole and Mary B. Heyward to support its decision. The petitioners’ close relationship with the corporation as shareholders and officers further weakened their argument, as they were essentially the ones setting the policy for on-site residence.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for lodging to be excludable from an employee’s gross income under Section 119, it must be genuinely necessary for the employee to perform their job duties. Employers and employees in similar situations must demonstrate that on-site lodging is indispensable for job performance. This ruling affects how companies structure compensation packages and housing policies, particularly for closely held corporations where shareholders are also employees. Future cases involving the tax treatment of employer-provided lodging will need to consider the proximity of alternative housing and the actual necessity of on-site residence. The decision underscores the importance of objective evidence when claiming tax exclusions based on employment conditions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.