Dodge v. Commissioner, 96 T. C. 172, 1991 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 9, 96 T. C. No. 9 (1991)

Proceeds from insurance speculation schemes do not qualify for exclusion from income under IRC section 104(a)(3) unless they relate to actual personal injuries or sickness.

Summary

Charles Dodge engaged in an insurance speculation scheme, purchasing numerous hospital indemnification policies (HIPs) and arranging hospitalizations for alleged injuries to collect substantial proceeds. The Tax Court held that these proceeds were not excludable under IRC section 104(a)(3) as they did not relate to actual personal injuries or sickness. The court found Dodge's claims and supporting evidence lacked credibility, leading to the conclusion that the hospitalizations were contrived. This decision highlights the need for genuine claims to qualify for tax exclusions and impacts how similar cases should be evaluated.

Facts

Charles Dodge, identified as a tax protester, engaged in an insurance speculation scheme from 1981 to 1984. He purchased multiple HIP policies from numerous insurance companies, totaling daily benefits ranging from $873 to $2,657 across these years. Dodge arranged several hospitalizations for alleged injuries, such as falls and back pain, which were often unwitnessed and treated by doctors with personal or financial ties to him. He received significant proceeds from these HIP policies, which he did not report on his tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued notices of deficiency to Dodge and Christine Roberts for the tax years 1981-1984. Dodge, who did not file returns, and Roberts, who omitted certain income, challenged these deficiencies. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determinations, finding that the HIP proceeds were taxable income and not excludable under section 104(a)(3).

Issue(s)

1. Whether the proceeds received by Charles Dodge under his hospital indemnification policies are excludable from income under IRC section 104(a)(3)?

Holding

1. No, because the proceeds did not relate to actual personal injuries or sickness, as required by section 104(a)(3).

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court applied IRC section 104(a)(3), which excludes from income amounts received through accident or health insurance for personal injuries or sickness. The court emphasized that the exclusion requires a direct connection to actual injuries or sickness. Dodge’s claims were deemed not credible due to the nature of the alleged injuries, the frequency and location of hospitalizations, and his relationships with the admitting physicians. The court noted that the mere payment by insurance companies under HIP policies does not automatically qualify for exclusion if the claims are not legitimate. The court’s decision was influenced by the lack of evidence supporting actual injuries and the circumstantial evidence suggesting contrived hospitalizations.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of genuine claims for tax exclusions under IRC section 104(a)(3). Attorneys should advise clients against engaging in insurance speculation schemes, as proceeds from such activities are taxable unless they relate to actual injuries or sickness. This ruling affects how similar cases should be analyzed, requiring robust evidence of actual medical necessity for hospitalizations. It may also lead to increased scrutiny by the IRS of claims under HIP policies, and it has been cited in subsequent cases to deny exclusions for insurance proceeds obtained through questionable means.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.