Stevens v. Commissioner, 54 T. C. 351 (1970)

Income from trust land purchased by a noncompetent Indian with personal funds is not exempt from federal income tax.

Summary

Bryan L. Stevens, a noncompetent Indian, purchased land from other allottees on the Fort Belknap Reservation, having it placed in trust under the Indian Reorganization Act. The issue before the U. S. Tax Court was whether the income Stevens earned from grazing cattle on this land was exempt from federal income tax. The court held that since Stevens purchased the land with his own funds and not by authority of Congress, the income was not exempt. This ruling emphasized the distinction between land purchased by the individual versus land purchased by Congressional authority, impacting how income from trust lands is taxed for noncompetent Indians.

Facts

Bryan L. Stevens, a noncompetent Indian, purchased 362. 59 acres of land from Joseph Shawl and Melda Black Hoop Shawl on December 9, 1947, and approximately 360 acres from Lillian Adams Werle and Lewis H. Werle on August 16, 1951, in exchange for land he had purchased from Edward Phares on June 30, 1950. All transactions were approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the land was taken in trust by the United States for Stevens under section 5 of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. Stevens used this land to graze cattle and sought to exempt the income derived from this activity from federal income tax.

Procedural History

The case initially proceeded to the U. S. Tax Court where an opinion was filed on May 27, 1969, holding that the income from the land was taxable. Following this, Stevens filed motions to vacate the decision and for a review and revision of the opinion, citing that the transactions were authorized under section 5 of the Act of June 18, 1934, not section 4 as previously considered. The court granted these motions and reconsidered the case, ultimately reaffirming its original decision on February 25, 1970.

Issue(s)

1. Whether income derived by a noncompetent Indian from grazing cattle on land purchased with personal funds and taken in trust under section 5 of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 is exempt from federal income tax.

Holding

1. No, because the income is not exempt under the applicable statutes. The court

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

found that since Stevens purchased the land with his own funds and not by authority of Congress, the provisions of 25 U. S. C. section 335, which might have provided an exemption, did not apply.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the provisions of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, specifically sections 4 and 5, and 25 U. S. C. section 335. It determined that section 5 of the Act allowed the Secretary of the Interior to take land in trust for an Indian but did not require the land to be delivered free of encumbrances. The court further interpreted 25 U. S. C. section 335, which extends certain provisions of the General Allotment Act to lands purchased by authority of Congress, to not apply to land purchased by Stevens himself. The court emphasized that Stevens could have taken title in fee but chose trust status, which did not alter the taxability of the income derived from the land. The court rejected Stevens' argument that the land should be treated as if purchased by authority of Congress, as this would extend beyond the plain language of the statute.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that income from trust land purchased with personal funds by noncompetent Indians is subject to federal income tax. It distinguishes between land acquired by an individual and land acquired by Congressional authority, impacting how attorneys should advise clients on tax planning involving trust lands. The ruling may influence future cases involving tax exemptions for income from trust lands and underscores the importance of understanding the source of land acquisition in tax matters. It also suggests that noncompetent Indians considering trust status for purchased lands should be aware of the potential tax consequences on income derived from those lands.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.