Transport Labor Contract/Leasing, Inc. & Subsidiaries v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 123 T. C. 154, 2004 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 34, 123 T. C. No. 9 (U. S. Tax Court 2004)

In a significant ruling on employee leasing arrangements, the U. S. Tax Court determined that Transport Labor Contract/Leasing, Inc. (TLC), a driver-leasing company, was the common-law employer of truck drivers it leased to various trucking companies. This decision impacted the applicability of the 50% deduction limitation on meal and entertainment expenses under IRC Section 274(n)(1), ruling that TLC, not the trucking companies, was subject to this limitation for the per diem payments it made to the drivers. This case clarifies the tax implications of employee leasing arrangements and sets a precedent for similar future cases.

Parties

Transport Labor Contract/Leasing, Inc. & Subsidiaries (Petitioner) v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent). The case originated in the U. S. Tax Court, with Transport Labor Contract/Leasing, Inc. as the petitioner and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as the respondent.

Facts

Transport Labor Contract/Leasing, Inc. (TLC), a wholly owned subsidiary of the petitioner, was engaged in the business of leasing truck drivers to small and mid-sized trucking companies. TLC was incorporated in Indiana with corporate headquarters in Arden Hills, Minnesota, and operations in Audubon, Minnesota, and Porter, Indiana. TLC's business model involved leasing drivers to trucking companies, which then used these drivers to transport goods and merchandise. TLC handled all employment-related functions such as hiring, firing, payroll, and benefits for these drivers. TLC paid per diem amounts to the drivers to cover their food and beverage expenses while traveling away from home, which became the central issue of the case. The per diem amounts were not broken down in the payments from the trucking companies to TLC, and TLC determined the portion of payments attributable to per diem.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in federal income tax for the petitioner for the taxable years ending August 31, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, amounting to $330,320, $28,346, $1,694,076, and $1,978,282 respectively. The Commissioner also alleged increased deficiencies for subsequent years due to disallowed net operating loss carrybacks. The petitioner filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging these determinations, particularly focusing on whether the limitation imposed by IRC Section 274(n)(1) applied to the per diem amounts paid by TLC. The case was heard by Judge Carolyn P. Chiechi, who rendered the opinion on August 9, 2004.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Issue(s)

Whether the limitation imposed by IRC Section 274(n)(1) applies to the per diem amounts paid by Transport Labor Contract/Leasing, Inc. to truck drivers?

Rule(s) of Law

IRC Section 274(n)(1) limits the deduction for food or beverage expenses to 50% of the amount otherwise allowable. Exceptions to this limitation are provided in IRC Section 274(e)(3), which includes reimbursed expenses under certain conditions. The common-law employment test, as outlined in cases like Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co. v. Darden, is used to determine the employer of an individual for tax purposes.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that Transport Labor Contract/Leasing, Inc. (TLC) was the common-law employer of the truck drivers and, therefore, the limitation imposed by IRC Section 274(n)(1) applied to the per diem amounts paid by TLC to these drivers.

Reasoning

The court applied the common-law employment test to determine that TLC was the employer of the truck drivers. Key factors considered included the right to control the drivers' activities, the hiring and termination of employment, the provision of employee benefits, and the tax treatment of the drivers. The court rejected the petitioner's reliance on Beech Trucking Co. v. Commissioner, clarifying that the central question was not solely who bore the expense but who was the employer under the common-law test. The court found that TLC had the right to direct and control the drivers' work and conduct, had the sole authority to hire and fire them, provided employee benefits, and treated the drivers as employees for tax purposes. The court also considered the contractual arrangements between TLC and the trucking companies, noting that TLC retained the authority to direct the drivers' work and conduct despite the trucking companies' involvement in dispatching functions. The court's analysis of the factors under the common-law employment test led to the conclusion that TLC was the employer of the drivers, thus subject to the IRC Section 274(n)(1) limitation on the per diem amounts.

Disposition

The U. S. Tax Court entered a decision for the respondent, affirming that the limitation imposed by IRC Section 274(n)(1) applied to the per diem amounts paid by Transport Labor Contract/Leasing, Inc. to the truck drivers.

Significance/Impact

This case has significant implications for the tax treatment of employee leasing arrangements. It clarifies that the common-law employer, in this case, TLC, is

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

responsible for the 50% deduction limitation on meal and entertainment expenses under IRC Section 274(n)(1). The decision sets a precedent for similar arrangements and may influence how companies structure their employee leasing contracts to manage tax liabilities. It also underscores the importance of the common-law employment test in determining employer status for tax purposes, potentially affecting future cases involving employee leasing and similar arrangements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.