Barrett v. Commissioner, 58 T. C. 284 (1972)

Post-retirement payments for non-competition and potential consulting services do not constitute self-employment income if the recipient does not actively engage in a trade or business.

Summary

In Barrett v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that payments received by Herbert Barrett under a post-retirement agreement with Philip Carey Manufacturing Co. were not self-employment income. Barrett, a former executive, received $12,000 annually in exchange for not competing with the company and being available for consulting services if requested. The court held that since Barrett did not actively offer his services to others and was not called upon for consulting, these payments did not constitute income from a trade or business. This case clarifies that passive payments for non-competition and potential future services do not trigger self-employment taxes unless the recipient is actively engaged in a trade or business.

Facts

Herbert Barrett was an executive vice president at Philip Carey Manufacturing Co. until his full-time employment ended on December 31, 1967. On January 5, 1962, he signed an agreement with the company for full-time employment through October 31, 1967, followed by payments of $12,000 annually until October 31, 1977, in exchange for not competing with the company and being available for consulting services if requested. After his full-time employment ended, Barrett did not provide any consulting services nor was he requested to do so. In 1969, he received $12,000 under this agreement, which the IRS argued was self-employment income subject to tax under section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency in self-employment tax against Barrett for the year 1969. Barrett and his wife petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to challenge this assessment. The Tax Court heard the case and rendered its decision on May 11, 1972.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $12,000 received by Herbert Barrett in 1969 under the agreement with Philip Carey constituted self-employment income subject to tax under section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the payments were not derived from a trade or business carried on by Barrett.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court analyzed whether the payments constituted “self-employment income” under section 1401, which requires that income be derived from a “trade or business” carried on by the individual. The court found that Barrett was not engaged in a trade or business as a consultant because he did not actively offer his services to others. The agreement prohibited him from working for competitors, and he had not provided any services nor been requested to do so by Philip Carey. The court cited Justice Frankfurter’s concurring opinion in Deputy v. du Pont, stating that carrying on a trade or business involves holding oneself out to others as engaged in selling goods or services. Since Barrett did not do this, the court concluded that the payments were not self-employment income. The court also noted that the nature of the compensation depended on the terms of the original contract, not Barrett’s subsequent inaction.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how post-retirement agreements are structured and taxed. It establishes that payments for non-competition and potential consulting services are not considered self-employment income if the recipient is not actively engaged in a trade or business. Legal professionals should advise clients to carefully draft retirement agreements to avoid unintended tax consequences. Businesses should consider whether they require actual services from retirees, as passive payments for availability may not be subject to self-employment taxes. Subsequent cases have distinguished this ruling where retirees actively engaged in consulting were found to have self-employment income. This case underscores the importance of the active engagement requirement in determining self-employment income status.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.