Gallagher v. Commissioner, 75 T. C. 313 (1980)

Payments received during second-career training are taxable income, not workmen's compensation or disability payments.

Summary

In Gallagher v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that salary continuation payments received by an air traffic controller during a second-career training program were taxable income. Gallagher, removed from his position due to medical reasons, participated in a training program under the Air Traffic Controllers Act, receiving his salary during training. The court determined these payments were not workmen's compensation under IRC section 104(a)(1) nor excludable under section 105(d) as wage continuation for disability. The decision hinged on the nature of the payments, which were tied to participation in the training rather than compensation for injury or sickness.

Facts

Joseph Gallagher, an air traffic controller, was removed from his duties due to a severe depressive reaction to a fatal air crash. He opted for second-career training in hotel management under the Air Traffic Controllers Act. During the training, he received his full salary. Gallagher excluded portions of these payments from his income as workmen's compensation or disability payments, which the IRS contested.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in Gallagher's income tax and additions to tax for negligence. Gallagher petitioned the Tax Court, which held that the payments were taxable income and upheld the IRS's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the salary continuation payments received by Gallagher during second-career training are excludable from gross income as workmen's compensation under IRC section 104(a)(1).
2. Whether these payments are excludable from gross income under IRC section 105(d) as wage continuation for disability.

Holding

1. No, because the payments were not made under a workmen's compensation act or in the nature of such an act; they were salary continuation during training, not compensation for personal injuries or sickness.
2. No, because the payments were not made as health or accident insurance but as salary continuation during a required training period.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court distinguished the salary continuation payments from workmen’s compensation, noting they were not made under a statute in the nature of workmen’s compensation. The Air Traffic Controllers Act aimed to provide training benefits and salary continuation to ease the transition to a new career, not to compensate for personal injuries or sickness. The court cited Blackburn v. Commissioner, where similar salary continuation was treated as hazard pay rather than workmen’s compensation. Additionally, the court found that the payments were contingent on participation in the training program, further distinguishing them from compensation for injury or sickness. The court also rejected the argument under section 105(d), stating the payments were not made as health or accident insurance but as salary during training, as supported by Rev. Rul. 75-119.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that salary continuation payments during mandated training programs are taxable income, not excludable as workmen’s compensation or disability payments. It impacts how similar benefits under government or employer training programs are treated for tax purposes. Legal practitioners should advise clients participating in such programs to report these payments as income. The ruling may influence how employers structure training benefits to avoid unintended tax consequences. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the principle that payments linked to training or employment conditions, rather than direct compensation for injury or sickness, are taxable.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.