

## ***Baker v. Commissioner, 70 T. C. 460 (1978)***

Payments for accrued leave received by commissioned officers upon military discharge are fully taxable if they exceed the statutory exclusion under section 112(b).

### **Summary**

In *Baker v. Commissioner*, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that payments for accrued leave received by a commissioned officer upon military retirement were fully taxable to the extent they exceeded the statutory exclusion of \$500 per month under section 112(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. Alexander E. Baker, Jr. , a retired Air Force officer, attempted to exclude from his gross income payments for 54. 5 days of accrued leave earned during combat service. The court held that since Baker had already utilized the maximum monthly exclusion during his active service, additional payments for accrued leave were not excludable. This decision clarifies the tax treatment of military compensation and underscores the distinction between the tax benefits available to enlisted personnel versus commissioned officers.

### **Facts**

Alexander E. Baker, Jr. , served in the U. S. Air Force and was involved in combat zones from August 6, 1963, to August 6, 1964, and from April 29, 1972, to February 7, 1973. During these periods, he excluded the maximum monthly statutory amounts from his base pay under section 112(b). Upon retirement on May 31, 1973, Baker received \$3,251. 40 for 60 days of unused accrued leave, which included 54. 5 days earned during combat service. He sought to exclude \$2,952. 57 of this amount from his 1973 gross income, arguing that it should be excluded under section 112(b).

### **Procedural History**

Baker filed a joint federal income tax return for 1973 and contested the IRS's determination of a deficiency of \$849. 65. He petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which heard the case and issued its opinion on June 15, 1978.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether payments received by a commissioned officer for accrued leave earned during combat service can be excluded from gross income under section 112(b) if the officer has already utilized the maximum monthly exclusion during active service.

### **Holding**

1. No, because once a commissioned officer has exhausted the \$500 per month exclusion under section 112(b), any additional payments, including those for accrued leave, are fully includable in gross income.

## **Court's Reasoning**

The court's decision hinged on the interpretation of section 112(b), which limits the exclusion of compensation for commissioned officers to \$500 per month during combat service. The court reasoned that since Baker had already excluded the maximum amount during his active service, additional payments for accrued leave did not qualify for further exclusion. The court emphasized the statutory language and rejected Baker's argument that he should be treated the same as enlisted personnel, who can exclude all compensation received in a combat zone. The court also upheld Revenue Ruling 73-187, which clarified that accrued leave payments are subject to the same limitations as other forms of compensation under section 112(b). The decision was supported by legislative history indicating Congress's intent to provide different tax benefits to enlisted personnel and commissioned officers based on income levels.

## **Practical Implications**

This decision clarifies that commissioned officers cannot exclude payments for accrued leave from gross income if they have already utilized the maximum monthly exclusion under section 112(b). Attorneys and tax professionals advising military personnel should ensure clients understand the limitations on exclusions for accrued leave payments upon discharge. The ruling may affect financial planning for retiring military officers, as it impacts the tax treatment of their compensation. It also reinforces the distinction between tax benefits for enlisted personnel and commissioned officers, potentially influencing future legislative considerations on military compensation and taxation.