Schmidt Baking Co. v. Commissioner, 107 T. C. 271 (1996)

An irrevocable letter of credit can constitute payment for tax deduction purposes if it secures vacation and severance pay within 2-1/2 months after the tax year's end.

Summary

Schmidt Baking Co. purchased an irrevocable letter of credit to fund vacation and severance pay accrued in 1991, within 2-1/2 months after the year's end. The issue was whether this constituted a payment allowing a deduction for the 1991 tax year. The court held that the letter of credit was a payment, allowing the deduction under the 2-1/2 month rule, as it was an irrevocable transfer of vested property to employees, includable in their income. This decision underscores that funding mechanisms like letters of credit can be considered payments for tax purposes, impacting how companies structure their employee benefit funding to optimize tax deductions.

Facts

Schmidt Baking Co. , an accrual basis taxpayer, had accrued vacation and severance pay liabilities for its 1991 fiscal year ending December 28. On March 13, 1992, within 2-1/2 months after the year's end, the company purchased an irrevocable standby letter of credit for $2,092,421 to fund these liabilities. The letter of credit listed each employee as a beneficiary with their respective accrued benefit amounts. The funding was secured by the company's general assets, but the employees were the sole beneficiaries, and the amounts were includable in their gross income for 1992 as of the transfer date.

Procedural History

Schmidt Baking Co. deducted the accrued vacation and severance pay on its 1991 tax return, claiming the deduction based on the letter of credit purchase within the 2-1/2 month period. The IRS disallowed the deduction, arguing that the letter of credit did not constitute payment. Schmidt Baking Co. then petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which held that the letter of credit did constitute payment, allowing the deduction for the 1991 tax year.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the purchase of an irrevocable letter of credit within 2-1/2 months after the end of the tax year constitutes a payment for the purpose of deducting accrued vacation and severance pay under IRC sections 83(h) and 404(a)(5).

Holding

1. Yes, because the letter of credit was an irrevocable transfer of vested property to the employees, includable in their income as of the transfer date, and thus

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

considered a payment under the 2-1/2 month rule.

Court’s Reasoning

The court’s decision hinged on interpreting the statutory and regulatory framework, particularly IRC sections 83(h), 162, and 404, along with related regulations. The court noted that the letter of credit represented a transfer of substantially vested interests in property to the employees, which were includable in their income under section 83. The court then analyzed the legislative history of the 2-1/2 month rule and concluded that the rule was intended to apply to situations where benefits were funded and vested within this period, equating such funding to payment. The court rejected the IRS’s argument that payment required actual cash in the employees’ hands, finding that the irrevocable nature of the letter of credit, combined with its inclusion in the employees’ income, satisfied the payment requirement. The court emphasized that this interpretation aligned with the legislative intent to treat funding within the 2-1/2 month period as a payment, allowing the deduction for the preceding tax year.

Practical Implications

This decision allows companies to use irrevocable letters of credit as a funding mechanism for employee benefits like vacation and severance pay, potentially securing tax deductions for the year in which the liability accrues if funded within the 2-1/2 month period. It underscores the importance of the timing and structure of funding mechanisms in tax planning, as companies can now strategically use such instruments to optimize their tax positions. The ruling may influence how companies structure their employee benefit plans, particularly in terms of funding and timing, to align with tax deduction rules. Subsequent cases have cited Schmidt Baking Co. when addressing the treatment of similar funding mechanisms for tax purposes, reinforcing its significance in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.