Smith v. Commissioner, 77 T. C. 1181 (1981)

Overtime compensation received by a U. S. government employee is considered 'paid by' the U. S. government for tax exclusion purposes, even if reimbursed by a third party.

Summary

Joseph T. Smith, a U. S. Customs Service employee in the Bahamas, sought to exclude his overtime pay from his gross income under IRC section 911(a)(2). The U. S. Tax Court held that this compensation was 'paid by' the U. S. government, despite airlines depositing funds for the overtime work. The court reasoned that the payment mechanism and control over the employee's duties by the U. S. government were determinative, not the source of funds. This ruling clarified the scope of the foreign earned income exclusion, impacting how similar cases are analyzed and reinforcing that the identity of the employer, not just the source of funds, is crucial in determining tax exclusions.

Facts

Joseph T. Smith worked as a customs inspector at a U. S. Customs preclearance station in Nassau, Bahamas, from September 7, 1974, to September 11, 1976. During this period, he earned overtime compensation for services performed outside regular hours, which was required by airlines requesting these services. The airlines had to deposit money or post a bond as mandated by 19 U. S. C. sections 267 and 1451. Smith attempted to exclude this overtime pay from his gross income under IRC section 911(a)(2), which excludes foreign earned income except for amounts 'paid by the United States or any agency thereof. '

Procedural History

Smith filed his federal income tax returns for 1975 and 1976, claiming an exclusion for his overtime compensation. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in these returns, leading Smith to petition the U. S. Tax Court. The court, after reviewing the case, ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that Smith's overtime compensation was not excludable from his gross income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Smith's overtime compensation, received while working for the U. S. Customs Service in the Bahamas, is excludable from gross income under IRC section 911(a)(2).
2. Whether IRC section 911(a)(2), as applied to Smith, is unconstitutional.

Holding

1. No, because Smith's overtime compensation was 'paid by' the U. S. government,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

as he remained a U. S. government employee under its control and supervision, despite the airlines' financial obligation.
2. No, because the court found that the tax exclusion's classification and application were rational and constitutionally sound.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the meaning of 'paid by' in IRC section 911(a)(2), concluding that it refers to the employer rather than the ultimate source of funds. Smith was a U. S. government employee, paid via U. S. Treasury checks, and subject to U. S. government control. The court distinguished prior cases like Mooneyhan and Wolfe, where the focus was on the source of funds, emphasizing that Smith's role was an intrinsically governmental function, aligning with Congress's intent to exclude U. S. government employees from the foreign earned income exclusion. The court also overruled its prior approach in Mooneyhan and Wolfe, stating that the 'source of funds' is not the controlling factor when determining who 'paid' the compensation. The court rejected Smith's constitutional challenge, finding the tax classification rational and within Congress's authority.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for U. S. government employees working abroad and seeking to exclude their income under IRC section 911(a)(2). It clarifies that even if a third party reimburses the government for an employee's compensation, if the employee remains under U. S. government control and receives payment through U. S. government channels, the compensation is considered 'paid by' the U. S. government. This ruling may affect how similar cases are analyzed, potentially leading to more stringent application of the foreign earned income exclusion for government employees. Practitioners should consider the identity of the employer and the degree of government control in advising clients on tax exclusions. Subsequent cases, like the 1981 amendment to IRC section 911, have further refined these principles, but the Smith case remains a pivotal precedent in understanding the interplay between employment and payment sources in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.