Turem v. Commissioner, 54 T. C. 1494 (1970)

Payments to employees for educational leave are taxable income if they are compensation for services or primarily for the benefit of the employer.

Summary

Jerry S. Turem, a social worker employed by San Francisco's Department of Public Welfare, received educational stipends from the California State Department of Social Welfare while on educational leave to study social work at the University of California. The stipends were funded by federal and state governments to improve the quality of social services. The Tax Court ruled that these payments were not excludable from Turem's gross income as scholarships or fellowship grants under IRC § 117(a), because they were compensation for services and primarily for the benefit of the grantors (the State and county), not primarily for Turem's education. This decision emphasizes that educational payments linked to employment obligations are taxable income.

Facts

Jerry S. Turem was employed as a senior social worker by the Department of Public Welfare of the City and County of San Francisco. In 1962, he applied for and received educational stipends from the California State Department of Social Welfare (CSDSW) to study social work at the University of California. The stipends covered his maintenance and educational expenses during the academic years 1962-1963 and 1963-1964. Turem was required to sign an agreement promising to work for the county for one year per academic year of study upon completion of his education. The stipends were funded by 75% federal and 25% state funds, intended to enhance the quality of social services in California.

Procedural History

Turem excluded the maintenance portion of the stipends from his gross income for tax years 1963 and 1964. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a notice of deficiency, determining that these payments were taxable. Turem petitioned the United States Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, ruling that the stipends were not excludable from gross income under IRC § 117(a).

Issue(s)

1. Whether the maintenance payments received by Turem during his educational leave are excludable from gross income as scholarships or fellowship grants under IRC § 117(a).

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the payments were compensation for services rendered by Turem and were made primarily for the benefit of the grantors (CSDSW and the county department), not primarily for Turem's education.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied IRC § 117(a) and the regulations under § 1. 117-4(c), which state that payments representing compensation for services or payments primarily for the benefit of the grantor are not excludable as scholarships or fellowship grants. The court found that the stipends were designed to improve the quality of social services in California, as evidenced by the requirement that recipients either be current county welfare department employees or preparing for such employment, and the obligation to work for the county after completing their studies. The court rejected Turem's argument that because he was not directly employed by CSDSW, the payments could not be considered compensation, noting the joint effort of federal, state, and county governments in providing social services. The court also emphasized that the stipends were treated as employment income, with deductions for taxes and continued accrual of employee benefits during Turem's educational leave. The decision was supported by precedent such as Bingler v. Johnson, which upheld the regulations under § 1. 117-4(c).

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that educational stipends linked to employment obligations are taxable income, even if they are funded by government agencies. Attorneys and tax professionals should advise clients that such payments cannot be excluded from income under IRC § 117(a) if they are tied to past, present, or future employment services or are primarily for the benefit of the employer. This ruling affects how similar educational leave programs should be structured and reported for tax purposes, particularly in government-funded programs. It also impacts the financial planning of employees considering educational leave, as they must account for the tax liability on such stipends. Later cases, such as Marjorie E. Haley, have applied this ruling to similar scenarios, reinforcing its importance in tax law regarding educational benefits.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.