Johnson v. Commissioner, 72 T. C. 355 (1979)

Premium payments by a corporation on split-dollar life insurance policies for a shareholder are taxable as income to the shareholder if they confer an economic benefit.

Summary

In Johnson v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that payments made by Clinton State Bank (CSB) on split-dollar life insurance policies for Howard Johnson, a shareholder and officer, were taxable as income to the Johnsons. The court determined that the premium payments provided an economic benefit to the Johnsons despite being payable to a trust for family members. The court rejected the argument that the policies benefited only the son and his children, emphasizing the broader family benefit and the pattern of tax planning. The decision clarifies that corporate payments for split-dollar life insurance on a shareholder's life are taxable dividends if they confer economic benefits, even if directed to a trust.

Facts

Howard and Nobia Johnson owned shares in Clinton State Bank (CSB). In 1973 and 1974, CSB's board approved split-dollar life insurance policies on Howard's life, with CSB paying the entire premium. The policies named CSB as the assignee and an irrevocable trust, the Howard Johnson Insurance Trust, as the beneficiary. The trust was established to benefit Howard's wife Nobia, son John, daughter-in-law, and grandchildren. The Johnsons did not report the premium payments as income, leading to a tax deficiency determination by the IRS.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in the Johnsons' 1974 and 1975 income taxes due to unreported income from the premium payments. The Johnsons petitioned the Tax Court to challenge this determination. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's position, ruling that the premium payments were taxable income to the Johnsons.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the premium payments made by CSB on split-dollar life insurance policies for Howard Johnson constitute taxable income to the Johnsons.
2. Whether the premium payments were intended as compensation for John Johnson, the son of Howard and Nobia.

Holding

1. Yes, because the premium payments conferred an economic benefit on the Johnsons, even though the policy proceeds were payable to a trust for the benefit of their family.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the court found that the policies were not intended as compensation for John Johnson but were part of a broader family benefit and tax planning strategy.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied general principles of taxation, relying on cases like Genshaft v. Commissioner and Epstein v. Commissioner, to determine that the premium payments constituted taxable income. The court rejected the Johnsons' argument that the policies benefited only John and his children, noting that the trust was established to benefit multiple family members, including Nobia. The court emphasized that the Johnsons enjoyed the economic benefit of the premium payments, as they were used to fund policies that fit into a broader pattern of tax planning for the family. The court also noted that the board resolutions did not specify the policies' beneficiaries, further supporting the view that the policies were not intended solely for John's benefit. The court's decision aligns with Revenue Rulings 64-328 and 79-50, which establish that premium payments on split-dollar policies are taxable to the insured if they provide an economic benefit.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how corporations and shareholders should structure split-dollar life insurance arrangements. It clarifies that such payments are taxable as dividends if they confer an economic benefit to the insured shareholder, even if the policy proceeds are directed to a trust for family members. Legal practitioners must advise clients on the tax implications of these arrangements, ensuring that any economic benefits are properly reported. Businesses may need to reconsider their compensation and insurance strategies to avoid unintended tax consequences. Subsequent cases, such as Revenue Ruling 79-50, have reinforced this principle, emphasizing the need for careful planning and reporting in split-dollar arrangements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.