Trujillo v. Commissioner, 68 T. C. 670, 1977 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 71 (U. S. Tax Court, August 3, 1977)

Compulsory contributions to a state disability insurance fund are deductible as state income taxes under IRC § 164(a)(3).

Summary

In Trujillo v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court held that mandatory contributions to California's State Disability Insurance Fund, withheld from an employee's wages, are deductible as state income taxes under IRC § 164(a)(3). The case involved Anthony Trujillo, who sought to deduct $90 withheld from his 1975 wages. The court rejected the IRS's position that these contributions were not deductible, affirming the deductibility based on the mandatory nature of the contributions and the state's characterization of them as taxes. This ruling invalidated Revenue Ruling 75-149 and aligned the treatment of California's system with that of Rhode Island's in the McGowan case.

Facts

Anthony Trujillo was employed by TASK Corp. in California during 1975 and earned over $9,000. Pursuant to sections 984-986 of the California Unemployment Insurance Code, 1% of his first $9,000 in wages ($90) was withheld by his employer and paid to the California State Disability Insurance Fund. Trujillo and his wife claimed this $90 as an itemized deduction on their 1975 federal income tax return, which the IRS disallowed. The Trujillos filed for summary judgment, arguing that the withheld funds were deductible as state income taxes.

Procedural History

The Trujillos filed a timely joint federal income tax return for 1975. After the IRS disallowed their deduction for the $90 withheld for the California disability insurance fund, they petitioned the U. S. Tax Court. The court granted summary judgment in favor of the Trujillos, holding that the contributions were deductible under IRC § 164(a)(3).

Issue(s)

1. Whether the compulsory contributions to the California State Disability Insurance Fund are deductible as state income taxes under IRC § 164(a)(3)?

Holding

1. Yes, because the contributions are mandatory and the state characterizes them as taxes, making them deductible under IRC § 164(a)(3).

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court reasoned that the contributions to the California disability insurance fund were compulsory and thus constituted state income taxes deductible under IRC § 164(a)(3). The court found that the California system, while different from Rhode Island's, was equally mandatory and that the state's classification of these contributions as taxes was consistent with previous rulings, such as McGowan v. Commissioner. The court rejected the IRS's argument that the contributions were optional, pointing out that all employees must be covered either by the state plan or an approved private plan. The court also invalidated Revenue Ruling 75-149, which had disallowed deductions for such contributions, finding it inconsistent with the mandatory nature of the contributions and the state's treatment of them as taxes. The court emphasized that the California Unemployment Insurance Code and judicial interpretations supported the compulsory nature of the contributions, aligning with the court's prior decision in McGowan.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for taxpayers in states with similar mandatory disability insurance systems. It allows employees to deduct contributions withheld from their wages as state income taxes, potentially reducing their federal tax liability. The ruling underscores the importance of state characterizations of such contributions as taxes and may influence how other state systems are treated for federal tax purposes. It also highlights the need for the IRS to align its revenue rulings with judicial interpretations of state laws. Subsequent cases involving similar state systems may rely on Trujillo to argue for the deductibility of mandatory contributions, while the IRS may need to reassess its position on Revenue Ruling 75-149 and related rulings. This case also emphasizes the importance of understanding the interplay between state and federal tax laws in determining deductibility.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.