Warbelow's Air Ventures, Inc. v. Commissioner, 118 T. C. 579 (U. S. Tax Court 2002)

The U. S. Tax Court ruled that Warbelow's Air Ventures, Inc. was not eligible for the Indian Employment Credit (IEC) under I. R. C. § 45A for wages paid to employees at an airport it leased from the State of Alaska. The court clarified that 'within an Indian reservation' means 'on' an Indian reservation, and that the airport land, despite being surrounded by Native lands, was not part of an Indian reservation. This decision underscores the precise geographic requirements for the IEC and its implications for businesses operating near but not on Native lands.

Parties

Warbelow's Air Ventures, Inc. (Petitioner) filed a petition against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) in the U. S. Tax Court. The case was designated as No. 10351-00.

Facts

Warbelow's Air Ventures, Inc. operates an air charter service with a facility in Galena, Alaska, which is located on land leased from the State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities. The Galena airport is surrounded by lands owned by the Doyon Native Regional Corporation and the Gana-A' Yoo Native Village Corporation, both established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). During the tax years in question (1996, 1997, and 1998), Warbelow's employed Alaska Native individuals who performed substantially all of their services at the Galena airport. Warbelow's claimed the Indian Employment Credit (IEC) under I. R. C. § 45A on its corporate tax returns for these years, but the credit was disallowed by the Commissioner.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Warbelow's Federal income taxes for the tax years ending April 30, 1996, 1997, and 1998, and issued a notice of deficiency disallowing the IEC. Warbelow's filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the disallowance of the IEC. The case was submitted fully stipulated under Rule 122 of the Tax Court Rules of Practice and Procedure. The standard of review applied by the court was de novo.

Issue(s)

Whether Warbelow's Air Ventures, Inc. qualifies for the Indian Employment Credit under I. R. C. § 45A for wages paid to employees who perform substantially all their services at the Galena airport, which is leased from the State of Alaska and is not located on an Indian reservation?

Rule(s) of Law

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

I. R. C. § 45A provides for an Indian Employment Credit (IEC) equal to 20% of the excess of qualified wages and health insurance costs paid or incurred by an employer in a taxable year over the amounts paid or incurred in 1993. A 'qualified employee' under § 45A(c)(1) must be an enrolled member of an Indian tribe or their spouse, perform substantially all services within an Indian reservation, and have a principal place of abode on or near the reservation. 'Indian reservation' is defined by § 45A(c)(7) to include reservations as defined in the Indian Financing Act of 1974 and the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that Warbelow's Air Ventures, Inc. does not qualify for the Indian Employment Credit under I. R. C. § 45A because the Galena airport, where the employees perform their services, is not located 'within an Indian reservation' as required by § 45A(c)(1)(B). The court interpreted 'within an Indian reservation' to mean 'on' an Indian reservation, and the airport land did not meet the statutory definition of an Indian reservation under either the Indian Financing Act or the Indian Child Welfare Act.

Reasoning

The court began its analysis by examining the statutory language of I. R. C. § 45A and its legislative history. It concluded that the phrase 'within an Indian reservation' in § 45A(c)(1)(B) should be interpreted to mean 'on' an Indian reservation, based on the legislative intent to encourage businesses to locate on reservations to employ Native Americans. The court then assessed whether the Galena airport land qualified as an 'Indian reservation' under the definitions provided by the Indian Financing Act and the Indian Child Welfare Act. It determined that the land did not qualify under either definition because it was not set aside for Indian use, was not under Federal superintendence, and was specifically excluded from ANCSA land selections for airport purposes. The court rejected Warbelow's argument that the airport was 'within' a reservation due to its proximity to ANCSA lands, emphasizing the geographic requirement of being 'on' a reservation.

Disposition

The U. S. Tax Court entered a decision in favor of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, affirming the disallowance of the Indian Employment Credit claimed by Warbelow's Air Ventures, Inc.

Significance/Impact

The Warbelow's case clarifies the geographic scope of the Indian Employment Credit under I. R. C. § 45A, requiring that qualifying services be performed 'on' an Indian reservation, not merely 'within' its proximity. This decision has implications for businesses operating near but not on Native lands, limiting their eligibility for

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the IEC. The ruling also underscores the importance of precise statutory interpretation in tax law, particularly in relation to credits designed to benefit specific communities. Subsequent courts have cited Warbelow's in cases involving similar geographic and definitional issues under federal tax credits, emphasizing the need for strict adherence to statutory definitions of 'Indian reservation'.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.