World Family Corp. v. Commissioner, 82 T. C. 851 (1984)

An organization can qualify for tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) if it is operated primarily for exempt purposes and does not engage in private inurement through unreasonable compensation.

Summary

World Family Corp. (WFC) sought tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) for its primary purpose of funding LDS missionaries and a secondary purpose of supporting scientific research. The court found WFC's missionary support program adequately described and its scientific research funding insubstantial, thus meeting the operational test for exempt purposes. Additionally, WFC's fundraising commission arrangement was deemed reasonable, not constituting private inurement. The court granted WFC tax-exempt status, highlighting the importance of clear operational plans and reasonable compensation in determining eligibility for tax exemption.

Facts

World Family Corp. (WFC) was organized as a nonprofit in Utah to provide grants and interest-free loans to missionaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (LDS Church). WFC's application for tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) included a primary focus on missionary support, with a secondary interest in funding scientific research on energy sources. WFC planned to fund missionaries based on need, church leader recommendations, and fund availability, with disbursements calculated to provide bare subsistence. The scientific research funding was projected to be a small portion of WFC's activities. WFC's fundraising involved offering commissions up to 20%, with a notable commission due to its president for securing stock donations.

Procedural History

WFC filed for tax-exempt status in 1978, which was not acted upon by the IRS within 270 days, prompting WFC to seek a declaratory judgment. The Tax Court reviewed the case based on the administrative record, and the IRS carried the burden of proof due to its delay. The court ultimately ruled in favor of WFC, granting the tax-exempt status.

Issue(s)

1. Whether WFC is operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, or other exempt purposes under Section 501(c)(3).
2. Whether WFC's net earnings inure to the benefit of private individuals, specifically through its commission system.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because WFC’s primary activity of supporting LDS missionaries is an exempt purpose, and its scientific research funding is insubstantial.
2. No, because WFC’s commission system is reasonable and does not constitute private inurement.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the operational test under Section 501(c)(3), requiring organizations to engage primarily in activities that accomplish exempt purposes. WFC’s missionary support program was deemed exempt as it funds missionaries engaged in spreading Christian doctrine, which the IRS acknowledged as a charitable activity. The court found WFC’s description of the program sufficient to conclude it was operated for public rather than private interests. Regarding scientific research funding, the court considered it insubstantial (10% of expenditures at peak operations) and thus not disqualifying for exempt status. On the issue of private inurement, the court found WFC’s commission system reasonable, as it was contingent on fundraising success and aligned with state statutes allowing similar commissions. The court emphasized that reasonable compensation does not constitute private inurement, even when paid to interested parties like WFC’s president.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that organizations seeking tax-exempt status must clearly describe their operational plans, especially when funding exempt activities like missionary support. The ruling establishes that secondary activities, such as scientific research funding, can be considered insubstantial if they constitute a small portion of the organization’s overall activities. For legal practitioners, the case underscores the importance of demonstrating that compensation arrangements are reasonable and tied to services rendered, even when paid to individuals with a personal interest in the organization. Businesses and nonprofits can use this case to structure their operations and compensation systems to avoid private inurement issues. Subsequent cases, such as People of God Community v. Commissioner, have cited this decision in analyzing similar issues of exempt purpose and private inurement.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.