King v. Commissioner, 77 T. C. 1113 (1981)

Interest on municipal obligations is excludable from gross income under Section 103(a)(1) if the obligation arises from a voluntary transaction, not under threat of condemnation.

Summary

In King v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether interest received on warrants issued by the Trinity River Authority (TRA) was excludable from gross income under Section 103(a)(1). The TRA had purchased land from the Kings, part of which was under threat of condemnation and part of which was a voluntary sale. The court held that interest on warrants related to the land under threat of condemnation was not excludable, following the precedent set in Drew v. United States. However, interest on warrants for the voluntarily sold land was excludable, as it was considered an exercise of TRA's borrowing power. This case clarifies the distinction between voluntary transactions and those under eminent domain for the purposes of tax exemptions on municipal interest.

Facts

Virginia S. King owned an interest in the Smither Farm, which was partially subject to a flowage easement and partially required in fee simple by the Trinity River Authority (TRA) for the Lake Livingston reservoir project. TRA offered to purchase the entire farm, including 2,590. 18 acres not subject to condemnation, to facilitate a land swap with the Texas Department of Corrections. The Kings accepted the offer, receiving cash and interest-bearing warrants as payment. The interest on these warrants was reported as excludable from gross income under Section 103(a)(1), which the Commissioner contested.

Procedural History

The Kings petitioned the Tax Court after the Commissioner determined deficiencies in their federal income taxes for the years 1971-1974, asserting that the interest on the warrants was taxable. The Tax Court, following the precedent set by the Fifth Circuit in Drew v. United States, ruled that interest on warrants related to land under threat of condemnation was not excludable. However, it held that interest on warrants for the voluntarily sold portion of the land was excludable under Section 103(a)(1).

Issue(s)

1. Whether the interest received on warrants issued by the Trinity River Authority for land subject to condemnation is excludable from gross income under Section 103(a)(1).
2. Whether the interest received on warrants issued by the Trinity River Authority for land not subject to condemnation is excludable from gross income under Section

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

103(a)(1).

Holding

1. No, because the interest on warrants for land subject to condemnation was not received in a voluntary transaction but under the threat of eminent domain, following Drew v. United States.
2. Yes, because the interest on warrants for land not subject to condemnation was received in a voluntary transaction and thus was an exercise of TRA's borrowing power, qualifying for exclusion under Section 103(a)(1).

Court's Reasoning

The court's decision was based on the distinction between voluntary transactions and those under the threat of condemnation. For the land subject to condemnation, the court followed Drew v. United States, which held that interest on obligations under threat of condemnation is not excludable because it is not part of a voluntary lending-borrowing transaction. For the land not subject to condemnation, the court found that the transaction was voluntary, and the issuance of interest-bearing warrants was an exercise of TRA's borrowing power. The court relied on cases like Commissioner v. Meyer and Kings County D. Co. v. Commissioner, which allowed interest exclusion for obligations issued in voluntary transactions. The court emphasized that the form of the obligation (warrants versus bonds) did not matter for tax exclusion purposes under Section 103(a)(1).

Practical Implications

This decision provides clarity for attorneys and taxpayers on the tax treatment of interest from municipal obligations. For similar cases, attorneys should analyze whether the transaction was voluntary or under threat of condemnation. The ruling reaffirms that only obligations arising from voluntary transactions qualify for the tax exclusion under Section 103(a)(1). This impacts how municipalities structure their land acquisition deals, potentially affecting the cost of such acquisitions. Businesses and individuals selling land to municipalities must consider the tax implications based on whether the sale is voluntary or under eminent domain. Later cases, such as those involving municipal financing, may reference King v. Commissioner to distinguish between taxable and excludable interest on municipal obligations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.