Jackson v. Commissioner, 108 T. C. 130 (1997)

Termination payments to retired independent contractors are not subject to self-employment tax if not derived from the trade or business previously carried on by the recipient.

Summary

William R. Jackson, a retired State Farm insurance agent, received termination payments post-retirement under an Agent's Agreement. The Tax Court, following the Ninth Circuit's decision in Milligan v. Commissioner, held that these payments were not subject to self-employment tax. The court reasoned that the payments were not derived from Jackson's prior insurance business but were more akin to a buyout or non-compete payment. This decision emphasized that for income to be taxable as self-employment income, it must be tied to the quantity or quality of the taxpayer's prior labor, not merely their past employment status.

Facts

William R. Jackson served as an independent contractor agent for State Farm Insurance Companies from 1954 to 1987, when he retired at age 63. Upon retirement, Jackson received termination payments in 1990 and 1991, calculated based on his commissions from the last year of service. These payments were contingent on Jackson returning State Farm's property and not competing with the company for one year. The IRS determined that these payments were subject to self-employment tax, which Jackson contested.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency for self-employment taxes on Jackson's termination payments for 1990 and 1991. Jackson petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination. The case was submitted fully stipulated. The Tax Court, influenced by the Ninth Circuit's decision in Milligan v. Commissioner, decided in favor of Jackson, holding that the termination payments were not subject to self-employment tax.

Issue(s)

1. Whether termination payments received by Jackson from State Farm after his retirement are subject to self-employment tax under sections 1401 and 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the termination payments were not "derived" from a trade or business carried on by Jackson, as they were not tied to the quantity or quality of his prior labor but rather to his status as a former agent and compliance with non-

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

compete and property return conditions.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the “nexus” test from Newberry v. Commissioner, which requires a connection between income and a trade or business actually carried on by the taxpayer. The court rejected the IRS’s argument that a “but for” test should apply, instead following the Ninth Circuit’s decision in Milligan, which held that termination payments to State Farm agents were not derived from their prior business activity. The court noted that Jackson’s payments were contingent on post-retirement conditions (returning property and not competing) and were not deferred compensation or tied to his overall earnings or years of service. The court also considered but rejected arguments that the payments should be treated as self-employment income due to their connection to Jackson’s prior work for State Farm. The majority opinion emphasized that the payments were not derived from Jackson’s insurance business activity but were more akin to a buyout or non-compete payment. Judge Parr’s concurring opinion suggested the payments could be characterized as a buyout of Jackson’s business or payment for a covenant not to compete, neither of which would be subject to self-employment tax. Judge Halpern dissented, arguing that the payments were derived from Jackson’s business relationship with State Farm and should be subject to self-employment tax.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that termination payments to retired independent contractors, which are not directly tied to prior labor but are contingent on post-termination conditions, are not subject to self-employment tax. Practitioners should analyze such payments to determine if they are truly derived from the taxpayer’s business activity or if they serve another purpose, such as a buyout or non-compete agreement. This ruling may influence how companies structure termination agreements with independent contractors, potentially leading to more explicit language regarding the nature of post-retirement payments. Subsequent cases, like Gump v. United States, have followed this reasoning, reinforcing the principle that such payments are not taxable as self-employment income. Businesses may need to adjust their compensation strategies to comply with this interpretation of the tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.