Placko v. Commissioner, 74 T. C. 452 (1980)

Payments from a union to laid-off members are not excludable from gross income as gifts if they are made without regard to financial need and serve the union's interests.

Summary

In Placko v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that payments received by Jerry S. Placko from the Northwest Airlines Master Executive Council (NWA-MEC) of the Air Line Pilots Association were not excludable as gifts under Section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code. Placko, laid off following a union strike, received payments funded by assessments on working pilots. The court found these payments were not gifts because they were made to bolster union solidarity and lacked the requisite detached and disinterested generosity. This case underscores the need to assess the true nature and motive behind union payments to determine their tax treatment.

Facts

Jerry S. Placko was a pilot employed by Northwest Airlines, a member of the Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA), and was laid off from September 24, 1975, to May 10, 1976, following a three-day strike called by the union. The Northwest Airlines Master Executive Council (NWA-MEC), a local branch of ALPA, adopted Resolution 75-41, which provided for monthly payments to the 25 laid-off pilots, including Placko. These payments, funded by a $15 monthly assessment on working pilots, totaled $5,153. 92 for Placko in 1976. The NWA-MEC did not consider the financial need of the recipients when distributing the funds.

Procedural History

Placko filed a joint federal income tax return for 1976, excluding the payments from his gross income as gifts. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a notice of deficiency, asserting that these payments should be included in Placko's gross income. Placko petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to challenge the deficiency, leading to the court's decision that the payments were not excludable as gifts under Section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payments received by Placko from NWA-MEC during 1976 were excludable from his gross income as gifts under Section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the payments were made to support union solidarity and were not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the result of detached and disinterested generosity, failing to meet the criteria for gifts under Section 102.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the legal principle from Commissioner v. Duberstein, which states that the intent of the transferor determines whether a payment is a gift. The court found that NWA-MEC’s primary motive was to maintain union effectiveness and solidarity, not to provide gifts out of detached and disinterested generosity. The court cited the absence of any consideration of the recipients’ financial need, the unrestricted use of the funds, and the union’s role in collecting and distributing the payments as key factors. The court also referenced similar cases, such as Colwell v. Commissioner and Brown v. Commissioner, which held that union payments without regard to need were not gifts. The court concluded that these payments were made to counteract the chilling effect of management’s retaliatory layoffs and to demonstrate union support for its members.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that union payments to members, even if motivated by a sense of solidarity, are not automatically excludable as gifts for tax purposes. Legal practitioners should advise unions to consider the financial need of recipients and impose restrictions on the use of funds if they wish to argue for gift treatment. Businesses should be aware that such payments may be taxable income to recipients. Subsequent cases, like Halsor v. Lethert, have applied similar reasoning. This ruling influences how unions structure support payments to ensure they meet the criteria for tax exclusion and impacts how similar cases are analyzed in terms of the transferor’s intent and the nature of the payments.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.