Alex v. Commissioner, 70 T. C. 322 (1978)

Illegal rebates and discounts paid by an insurance agent to policyholders are not adjustments to the purchase price excludable from gross income but are deductions from gross income barred by IRC section 162(c).

Summary

James Alex, an insurance agent, paid rebates and gave discounts to policyholders to facilitate sales. The Tax Court held that these payments could not be excluded from Alex's gross income as adjustments to the purchase price. Instead, they were treated as business expenses, which were disallowed under IRC section 162(c) due to their illegality under state law. The court overruled Schiffman v. Commissioner, clarifying that such payments by agents, not sellers, are not excludable from gross income. This ruling has significant implications for how commissions and rebates by agents are treated for tax purposes.

Facts

James Alex was an insurance agent for Jefferson National Life Insurance Co. He devised two schemes to sell life insurance policies: a "rebate" scheme where he issued a check to the client for the first year's premium, which the client then used to pay Jefferson, and a "discount" scheme where he reduced the premium payable to Jefferson by the sum of the cash value and his commission. These schemes were illegal under California law, and Alex was aware of their illegality. He reported his commissions as income but claimed the rebates and discounts as a deduction for "cost of goods sold and/or operations. "

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Alex's 1972 federal income tax and disallowed the claimed deduction for the rebates and discounts. Alex petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, arguing that these payments should be excluded from his gross income as adjustments to the purchase price. The Tax Court overruled Schiffman v. Commissioner and held for the Commissioner, ruling that the payments were not excludable from gross income and were barred as deductions under IRC section 162(c).

Issue(s)

1. Whether rebates and discounts paid by an insurance agent to policyholders constitute downward adjustments to the agent's gross income.
2. Whether such payments, if not excludable from gross income, are deductible as business expenses under IRC section 162(a).

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the payments were not adjustments to the purchase price but were instead deductions from gross income, which are barred by IRC section 162(c) due to their illegality.
2. No, because even if the payments were considered business expenses, they would be disallowed under IRC section 162(c) as illegal payments under state law.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that since Alex was not the seller of the insurance policies, the rebates and discounts he paid could not be considered adjustments to the purchase price. Instead, they were treated as business expenses, which are subject to the disallowance provisions of IRC section 162(c). The court overruled Schiffman v. Commissioner, stating that allowing such exclusions would open the door to evasion of IRC section 162(c). The court emphasized that only the buyer or seller should benefit from exclusions based on adjustments to the purchase price, not an agent. The court also considered policy implications, noting that a broader application of the exclusionary principle would undermine the purpose of IRC section 162(c). The concurring opinion by Judge Wilbur supported the majority's reasoning, arguing that the commissions received by Alex were clearly includable in gross income under IRC section 61(a). The dissenting opinions argued that Schiffman should not have been overruled, but the majority's view prevailed.

Practical Implications

This decision significantly impacts how commissions and rebates by agents are treated for tax purposes. It clarifies that illegal rebates and discounts paid by agents cannot be excluded from gross income as adjustments to the purchase price. Instead, they must be treated as business expenses, which are subject to disallowance under IRC section 162(c) if they are illegal under state or federal law. This ruling may affect how agents structure their compensation and how they report income and expenses for tax purposes. It also has implications for businesses that use agents or sales representatives, as it may influence the design of compensation structures to avoid similar tax issues. The decision has been applied in subsequent cases involving similar issues, such as in the context of illegal kickbacks or rebates in other industries. Legal practitioners should advise clients to carefully consider the tax implications of any rebates or discounts offered by agents, especially in light of state laws that may render such practices illegal.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.