Hughes v. Commissioner, 81 T. C. 683 (1983)

Membership in a recognized religious sect with established tenets against public insurance is required for exemption from self-employment taxes under Section 1402(g) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In Hughes v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that Gregg B. Hughes was not exempt from self-employment taxes despite his moral objection to Social Security because he was not a member of a recognized religious sect opposed to public insurance as required by IRC Section 1402(g). The court found the statutory requirement constitutional, distinguishing it from exemptions for conscientious objectors in military service, and upheld the deficiency assessed by the Commissioner.

Facts

Gregg B. Hughes, a lawyer, filed his 1978 Federal income tax return with an application for exemption from self-employment taxes, claiming a conscientious objection to participating in the Social Security system. He waived all rights to Social Security benefits and indicated he was not a member of any religious group with established tenets opposed to public insurance. Hughes stipulated that his objection was based on moral and conscientious beliefs, not derived from any religious sect.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Hughes' self-employment taxes for 1978. Hughes petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which heard the case and issued its opinion on October 4, 1983, denying Hughes' exemption and affirming the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether an individual who is not a member of a recognized religious sect with established tenets opposed to public insurance is entitled to an exemption from self-employment taxes under IRC Section 1402(g).
2. Whether the statutory requirement of membership in a religious sect is constitutionally infirm.

Holding

1. No, because the statute explicitly requires membership in a recognized religious sect with established tenets against public insurance, which Hughes did not meet.
2. No, because Congress has the power to make such a distinction, and there is a rational basis for it related to administrative ease and the objectives of the social

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

security system.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court, in its analysis, emphasized that the plain language of IRC Section 1402(g) requires membership in a recognized religious sect with established tenets opposed to public insurance for exemption from self-employment taxes. Hughes admitted he was not a member of such a sect, thus failing to meet the statutory criteria. The court further reasoned that Congress has broad discretion in classifying taxpayers subject to or exempt from the Social Security tax, citing Helvering v. Davis and Steward Machine Co. v. Davis. The court found a rational basis for the distinction in the administrative ease of verifying claims through recognized religious sects and in the requirement that these sects provide for their members, as per Section 1402(g)(1)(D). The court also distinguished this case from exemptions for conscientious objectors in military service, noting that the latter resulted from legislative choice and not constitutional mandate. The court concluded that the statutory requirement was constitutional and upheld the deficiency assessed by the Commissioner.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that individuals seeking exemption from self-employment taxes under IRC Section 1402(g) must be members of recognized religious sects with established tenets against public insurance. Legal practitioners advising clients on such exemptions must ensure clients meet these criteria. The ruling upholds the constitutionality of this requirement, emphasizing Congress’s power to make such distinctions. This case may influence how similar claims are analyzed, reinforcing the need for strict adherence to statutory language. It also highlights the difference between exemptions in tax law and those in military service, affecting how attorneys approach cases involving conscientious objections in different legal contexts.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.