Benninghoff v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 216 (1978)

Lodging provided by an employer must be on the business premises to be excludable from gross income under IRC Section 119.

Summary

Ronald Benninghoff, a Canal Zone policeman, sought to exclude the value of employer-provided lodging and utilities from his taxable income under IRC Section 119. The Tax Court held that although Benninghoff was required to live in the Canal Zone for his job and the lodging was for the employer's convenience, it was not located on the business premises. Therefore, the value of the lodging and utilities was taxable income. The decision underscores the necessity of the 'business premises' condition for Section 119 exclusions, impacting how similar claims by public employees are treated.

Facts

Ronald Benninghoff was employed as a policeman by the Canal Zone Government, a U. S. agency operating under a treaty with Panama. He was required to live within the Canal Zone, specifically in the Balboa district, as a condition of his employment. The government provided him with lodging and utilities, deducting their value from his wages. Benninghoff excluded this value from his 1973 federal income tax return, claiming it was excludable under IRC Section 119.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Benninghoff's 1973 federal income tax and Benninghoff petitioned the U. S. Tax Court. The court reviewed the case and ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that the lodging did not meet the 'business premises' requirement of Section 119.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the value of lodging and utilities provided to Benninghoff by the Canal Zone Government is excludable from his gross income under IRC Section 119.

Holding

1. No, because the lodging was not furnished on the business premises of the employer as required by Section 119.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the three conditions of Section 119: the lodging must be a condition of employment, for the employer's convenience, and on the business premises. Benninghoff met the first two conditions but failed the third. The court

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

emphasized that ‘business premises’ must bear an integral relationship to the employer’s business activities. They rejected Benninghoff’s argument that the entire Canal Zone constituted the business premises, finding no significant employer activities at his residence. The court also distinguished cases involving highway patrolmen, where the entire state was considered the business premises, noting the unique duties performed by those employees. A concurring opinion agreed with the majority but disagreed that employee duties performed in the residence could make it part of the business premises. A dissent argued that the entire Canal Zone should be considered the business premises.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that for lodging to be excluded from gross income under Section 119, it must be on premises where the employer conducts a significant portion of its business. It impacts how public employees, particularly those in law enforcement or similar roles, may claim exclusions for employer-provided housing. Attorneys should carefully analyze whether the location of provided lodging is integral to the employer’s operations. The decision also affects how government agencies structure housing benefits for employees to avoid unintended tax consequences. Subsequent cases have cited Benninghoff to uphold strict interpretations of the ‘business premises’ requirement.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.