Morrison v. Commissioner, 53 T. C. 365 (1969)

Income from commissions must be attributed to the individuals who earned it rather than a corporation that did not provide services or have a legitimate business purpose for receiving it.

Summary

In Morrison v. Commissioner, the Tax Court held that insurance commissions received by C. P. I. , a corporation, should be taxed to the individuals who actually earned them, Morrison and Herrle, rather than the corporation. Morrison and Herrle, though employees of C. P. I. , conducted insurance sales without the corporation's involvement or authorization. The court found that C. P. I. lacked a legitimate business purpose for receiving the commissions, as it was not licensed to sell insurance and did not direct or control the insurance sales activities. This ruling emphasizes the importance of a corporation's active role and legal authorization in business transactions to justify income attribution to the corporation.

Facts

Morrison and Herrle, employees of C. P. I. , agreed to split commissions from insurance sales, with Herrle being the only one licensed to sell insurance. C. P. I. was not licensed or authorized to sell insurance, had no employment records or business expenses related to insurance, and did not direct or control the insurance sales activities. The insurance commissions in question were paid to C. P. I. , but the court found that the income was generated from the individual efforts of Morrison and Herrle, not from any corporate activity of C. P. I.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies against Morrison, arguing that the insurance commissions should be taxed to him and Herrle individually. Morrison petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court held a trial and issued its decision, finding for the Commissioner and attributing the income to Morrison and Herrle.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the insurance commissions received by C. P. I. should be attributed to the corporation or to Morrison and Herrle individually?

Holding

1. No, because the court found that C. P. I. did not earn the right to the commissions, as it was not involved in the insurance sales and had no legitimate business purpose for receiving the income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the principle that income should be taxed to the entity that earned it. The court found that C. P. I. did not earn the commissions because it was not licensed to sell insurance, did not direct or control the insurance sales activities, and had no business expenses or employment records related to insurance. The court emphasized that the commissions were a result of the individual efforts of Morrison and Herrle, not any corporate activity of C. P. I. The court cited Jerome J. Roubik, 53 T. C. 365 (1969), to support its conclusion that the income should be attributed to the individuals. The court also noted that C. P. I. ‘s lack of a legitimate business purpose for receiving the commissions further supported attributing the income to Morrison and Herrle.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for how income attribution is analyzed in tax cases involving corporations and their employees. It emphasizes that a corporation must have a legitimate business purpose and be actively involved in generating income to justify attributing that income to the corporation rather than the individuals who performed the services. Attorneys should carefully examine the corporate structure, licensing, and business activities when advising clients on income attribution issues. This case may also impact business practices, as it highlights the risks of using a corporation to receive income generated by individuals without proper corporate involvement. Subsequent cases, such as Jerome J. Roubik, have applied similar reasoning in determining income attribution.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.