Weber v. Commissioner, 103 T. C. 378 (1994)

An ordained minister of the United Methodist Church was classified as an employee for federal income tax purposes based on the degree of control exerted by the church over the minister's work.

Summary

Michael D. Weber, an ordained minister of the United Methodist Church, claimed to be self-employed for tax purposes in 1988. The Tax Court analyzed whether Weber was an employee or self-employed under common law rules, focusing on the degree of control the church had over his duties. The court found that Weber was subject to significant control by the church, including mandatory duties, assignment to churches by bishops, and oversight by district superintendents. Consequently, the court held that Weber was an employee, and his expenses should be deducted as miscellaneous itemized deductions subject to the 2% adjusted gross income limitation, rather than as business expenses on Schedule C.

Facts

Michael D. Weber, an ordained minister since 1978, was assigned to serve at the Concord United Methodist Church and later at Plank Chapel United Methodist Church in 1988 by the bishop of the North Carolina Annual Conference. Weber's duties were outlined in the Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church, and he was subject to supervision by district superintendents and the Annual Conference. He received a salary, parsonage, utility, and travel allowances, and various benefits including pension contributions, health insurance, and life insurance partially paid by the local churches. Weber reported his income and expenses on Schedule C of his 1988 tax return, claiming he was self-employed.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Weber's 1988 federal income tax, asserting that Weber was an employee rather than self-employed. The case was heard in the United States Tax Court, which assigned it to a Special Trial Judge. The Tax Court reviewed the case under common law rules to determine the employment status of Weber.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Michael D. Weber, an ordained minister of the United Methodist Church, was an employee or self-employed for federal income tax purposes in 1988.

Holding

1. Yes, because Weber was subject to significant control by the United Methodist Church, including mandatory duties and assignments, and received benefits

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

typically provided to employees.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied common law rules to determine Weber’s employment status, focusing on the degree of control exercised by the United Methodist Church. The court found that the church controlled Weber’s work through the Discipline, which outlined his duties and subjected him to oversight by district superintendents and the Annual Conference. The court also considered that Weber was assigned to churches by bishops, could not refuse assignments, and was provided with a salary and various benefits, indicating an employment relationship. The court acknowledged that the level of control over professional services, like those of a minister, might be less direct but still found it sufficient to classify Weber as an employee. The court cited precedents like *James v. Commissioner* and *Azad v. United States* to support its conclusion that despite the nature of professional services, many professionals are employees. The court also noted the permanency of the relationship and the integral role of ministers in the church’s mission as supporting factors for employee status.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how ministers and other professionals within religious organizations are classified for tax purposes. It sets a precedent that significant control over a minister’s duties, assignments, and benefits can lead to an employment classification, affecting how their income and expenses are reported on tax returns. Practitioners should consider this ruling when advising ministers on their tax status, ensuring that deductions for ministerial expenses are correctly categorized as miscellaneous itemized deductions. The decision also has implications for religious organizations in structuring their relationships with ministers to comply with tax laws. Subsequent cases involving ministers from other denominations may need to be analyzed on their specific facts, but this ruling provides a framework for determining employment status based on control and benefits.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.