Waterman v. Commissioner, 107 T. C. 128 (1996)

Severance payments received by military personnel while in a combat zone are not excludable from gross income under Section 112 unless directly tied to active service in the combat zone.

Summary

In Waterman v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether a severance payment received by a Navy serviceman, Ralph F. Waterman, was excludable from gross income under Section 112, which allows exclusion for compensation received for active service in a combat zone. Waterman, who accepted an early separation offer while serving in the Persian Gulf, argued that the entire $44,946 severance payment should be excluded. The court held that the payment was not excludable because it was compensation for agreeing to leave the military, not for service in a combat zone, despite the fact that the entitlement to the payment arose while in the combat zone. The decision clarifies that for compensation to be excluded under Section 112, it must be directly linked to active service within a combat zone.

Facts

Ralph F. Waterman served in the U. S. Navy for over 14 years and was stationed aboard the U. S. S. America in the Persian Gulf, a designated combat zone, from January 1 through May 4, 1992. On April 20, 1992, while in the combat zone, Waterman accepted an early separation offer from the Navy as part of a downsizing program. The agreement resulted in a $44,946 lump-sum special separation payment, measured in part by his years of service, and he was discharged honorably on May 18, 1992. The IRS initially determined a tax deficiency on the full amount but later conceded that $2,382, representing the portion of the payment attributable to time served in the combat zone, was excludable under Section 112.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a statutory notice of deficiency to Waterman for the 1992 taxable year, asserting a tax deficiency and additions to tax. Waterman petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which heard the case fully stipulated. The IRS conceded the additions to tax but maintained that the majority of the separation payment was taxable. The Tax Court’s decision was the first instance ruling on the issue of whether a severance payment received while in a combat zone was excludable under Section 112.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the entire $44,946 severance payment received by Waterman while serving in a combat zone is excludable from gross income under Section 112.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the severance payment was compensation for agreeing to leave the military, not for active service performed in a combat zone, despite the entitlement arising while in the combat zone.

Court's Reasoning

The court's decision hinged on the interpretation of Section 112, which excludes from gross income compensation received for active service in a combat zone. The court focused on the statutory language requiring that the compensation be earned for service in a combat zone. The severance payment was not for service performed but for Waterman's agreement to leave the Navy, which was not tied to active service in the combat zone. The court distinguished this from reenlistment bonuses, which could be excluded if the entitlement arose in the combat zone, as those bonuses relate to future service. The court also rejected the argument that the severance payment was akin to a pension, noting that pensions are explicitly not excludable under Section 112 and that Waterman was not eligible for a pension at the time of separation. The court concluded that only compensation directly linked to active service in a combat zone qualifies for exclusion under Section 112.

Practical Implications

This ruling clarifies that severance payments to military personnel are not automatically excludable from gross income under Section 112, even if received while in a combat zone. Legal practitioners advising military clients should ensure that any compensation claimed to be excludable under Section 112 is directly tied to active service in a combat zone, not merely for an action taken while there. The decision impacts how military severance payments are taxed and could affect military personnel's financial planning. Subsequent cases and IRS guidance may further refine the application of this ruling, but attorneys should be cautious in advising clients on the tax treatment of military severance payments.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.