Ben C. Land v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 683 (1974)

Civilian pilots flying into combat zones are not entitled to the combat pay exclusion under section 112, and payments labeled as alimony must be analyzed based on their nature, not their label, to determine tax deductibility.

Summary

Ben C. Land, a Braniff Airways pilot, sought to exclude part of his salary earned from flying into South Vietnam under section 112(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides a combat pay exclusion for military personnel. The court held that Land, as a civilian, did not qualify for this exclusion. Additionally, Land attempted to deduct payments to his former wife as alimony, but the court ruled these payments were part of a property settlement and thus not deductible. The decision hinges on the legal distinction between civilian and military service for tax purposes and the characterization of payments in divorce agreements.

Facts

Ben C. Land, a Braniff Airways pilot since 1946, flew military personnel and materiel to South Vietnam in 1969, receiving premium pay for these flights. He excluded $500 per month from his income under section 112(b), claiming an assimilated rank of lieutenant colonel as per a Department of Defense certificate. Land also made payments to his former wife post-divorce, claiming these as alimony deductions. These payments were part of a property settlement agreement that included a promissory note and the division of various assets.

Procedural History

Land filed for a Federal income tax deficiency of $2,898. 08 for 1969. He petitioned the Tax Court to challenge the disallowance of his combat pay exclusion and alimony deduction claims. The Tax Court consolidated these issues and ruled against Land on both.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a civilian pilot flying into a combat zone is entitled to exclude a portion of his salary under section 112(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether payments made by the petitioner to his former wife are deductible as alimony under section 215(a) or are part of a property settlement.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioner was not a member of the Armed Forces and the combat pay exclusion under section 112(b) applies only to military personnel.
2. No, because the payments were part of a property settlement and not alimony, as they were fixed, did not vary with the payer’s income, and were not contingent on

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the recipient’s support needs.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that section 112(b) clearly applies to members of the Armed Forces, and Land’s status as a civilian pilot did not qualify him for the exclusion, regardless of his assimilated rank or the nature of his work. The court cited previous cases that supported this interpretation. On the alimony issue, the court analyzed the property settlement agreement, noting that the payments were fixed and secured by a promissory note, indicative of a property settlement rather than alimony. The court emphasized that the tax consequences depend on the nature of the payments, not their label, and found that the payments were in satisfaction of the wife’s vested property interest, not support.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that civilian contractors working in combat zones are not entitled to the combat pay exclusion, affecting how such income is reported for tax purposes. It also underscores the importance of carefully drafting divorce agreements to ensure payments intended as alimony are structured to meet legal criteria for deductibility. Practitioners must consider the nature of payments over their labels when advising clients on tax implications of divorce settlements. This case has been cited in subsequent rulings to distinguish between alimony and property settlements, impacting how similar cases are analyzed in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.