Jerry S. Turem v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 54 T. C. 1494 (1970)

Payments to resident physicians, even if labeled as stipends from grants, are taxable income if they are compensation for services rendered to the benefit of the grantor.

Summary

In Turem v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that stipends received by a psychiatry resident from a hospital, funded by a National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) grant, were taxable income. The resident, Jerry S. Turem, argued that the payments were scholarships or fellowship grants and thus excludable from income under Section 117. However, the court found that the payments were compensation for services rendered to the hospital, not primarily for educational purposes. The decision hinged on the nature of the payments being tied to Turem's duties as a resident, which were extensive and supervised by the hospital, indicating an employee-employer relationship rather than a scholarship or fellowship.

Facts

Jerry S. Turem was a resident in psychiatry at a hospital that received a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Turem received payments from this grant, which he claimed as a scholarship or fellowship grant under Section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code, seeking to exclude them from his gross income. The hospital required Turem to perform various duties, including patient care, supervision of medical students, and administrative tasks. These duties were under the direct or indirect supervision of the hospital's staff psychiatrists. The payments Turem received were referred to as "Salaries and Employment Benefits" by the hospital, and were competitive with other hospitals in the area.

Procedural History

Turem filed his tax return claiming a deduction for the payments received from the hospital. Upon audit, the IRS determined that these payments were not excludable under Section 117 and should be included in Turem's gross income. Turem contested this determination, leading to a trial before the Tax Court. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's position, ruling that the payments were taxable income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether payments received by Turem from the hospital, funded by an NIMH grant, are excludable from gross income under Section 117 as scholarships or fellowship grants.

Holding

1. No, because the payments were compensation for services rendered to the hospital, not primarily for the purpose of furthering Turem's education.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the regulations under Section 117, which exclude from gross income amounts received as scholarships or fellowship grants but not those paid as compensation for services or primarily for the benefit of the grantor. The court found that Turem’s payments were compensation for his extensive and valuable services to the hospital, which included patient care, supervision of medical students, and administrative tasks. These services were under the supervision of the hospital’s staff, indicating an employee-employer relationship rather than a scholarship or fellowship. The court also noted that the payments were tied to Turem’s status as a resident and were not dependent on need but on his length of service. The court distinguished this case from others where payments were found to be primarily for educational purposes, emphasizing that the hospital, not NIMH, was the grantor of the payments. The court cited Bingler v. Johnson, which upheld the validity of these regulations, and other cases where similar payments to resident physicians were found to be taxable income.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that payments to resident physicians, even if funded by grants, are taxable income if they are compensation for services rendered to the benefit of the grantor. Legal practitioners should advise clients in similar situations that such payments are not excludable under Section 117 unless they are primarily for educational purposes. This ruling impacts how hospitals and other institutions structure payments to residents and how residents report these payments for tax purposes. It also affects the financial planning of residents, who must account for these payments as income. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the principle that the nature of the payment, not its source, determines its tax treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.