Speer v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 144 T. C. 279 (2015)

In Speer v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that lump-sum payments for unused vacation and sick leave received by a retired Los Angeles Police Department detective upon retirement were not excludable from gross income under I. R. C. Section 104(a)(1). Clarence Speer argued that these payments, accrued during periods of temporary disability, should be excluded as workmen's compensation for personal injuries or sickness. The court, however, found that these payments were not made under a workmen's compensation act but rather under a collective bargaining agreement, and thus were taxable as income. This decision clarifies the distinction between payments for workmen's compensation and those stemming from employment benefits, impacting how such payments are treated for tax purposes.

Parties

Clarence William Speer and Susan M. Speer, Petitioners, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent. The Speers were the taxpayers in the case, represented in pro per, while the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was the respondent, represented by Jonathan N. Kalinski.

Facts

Clarence Speer, a retired detective from the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), received a lump-sum payment of $53,513 upon retirement in 2009. This payment consisted of $30,773 for 541 hours of unused vacation time and $22,740 for 800 hours of unused sick leave. During his service, Speer had periods of temporary disability leave due to duty-related injuries or sickness, starting in 1982 and ending in 2007. The City of Los Angeles paid Speer his base salary during these disability periods under section 4. 177 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code (LAAC). Speer argued that at least portions of his leave payments should be excluded from his gross income under I. R. C. Section 104(a)(1) as workmen's compensation for personal injuries or sickness.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Speers' 2008 and 2009 federal income taxes, amounting to $14,832 and $68,179, respectively. The Speers filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging these deficiencies. The only issue remaining for decision was whether the leave payments were excludable from their 2009 gross income. All other issues had been settled or were merely computational. The court conducted a trial on February 3, 2014, and issued its opinion on April 16, 2015.

Issue(s)

Whether the lump-sum payments received by Clarence Speer for unused vacation

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

time and sick leave upon his retirement from the LAPD are excludable from his 2009 gross income under I. R. C. Section 104(a)(1) as amounts received under a workmen's compensation act as compensation for personal injuries or sickness?

Rule(s) of Law

Gross income means all income from whatever source derived, including compensation for services, as provided by I. R. C. Section 61(a). Lump-sum payments for accrued vacation and sick leave are considered compensation for services and are therefore taxable as gross income. I. R. C. Section 104(a)(1) excludes from gross income "amounts received under workmen's compensation acts as compensation for personal injuries or sickness. " Section 1. 104-1(b) of the Income Tax Regulations extends this exclusion to amounts received under "a statute in the nature of a workmen's compensation act. "

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the lump-sum payments received by Clarence Speer for unused vacation time and sick leave were not received under a workmen's compensation act as compensation for personal injuries or sickness. Therefore, these payments were not excludable from the Speers' 2009 gross income under I. R. C. Section 104(a)(1).

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the leave payments were made pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement (Memorandum of Understanding No. 24 between the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Police Protective League), not under LAAC section 4. 177, which is considered a workmen's compensation act. The court noted that LAAC section 4. 177 provided Speer with his base salary during periods of temporary disability, but the leave payments were separate from these disability payments. The court distinguished the case from Givens v. Commissioner, where payments out of accumulated sick leave were found to be excludable under a comprehensive workmen's compensation scheme. The court also found that the Speers failed to substantiate how many hours, if any, of the unused leave were accrued during Speer's disability leaves of absence. The court emphasized that the leave payments were compensation for services rendered, not for the disability itself, and thus were not excludable under I. R. C. Section 104(a)(1).

Disposition

The court sustained the Commissioner's adjustment, including the leave payments in the Speers' 2009 gross income, and entered a decision under Rule 155 of the Federal Tax Court Rules.

Significance/Impact

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Speer decision clarifies the distinction between payments made under a workmen’s compensation act and those made under employment benefits agreements. It establishes that lump-sum payments for unused vacation and sick leave, even if accrued during periods of temporary disability, are not excludable from gross income under I. R. C. Section 104(a)(1) unless they are specifically provided for under a workmen’s compensation act. This ruling impacts how such payments are treated for tax purposes and may affect the tax planning strategies of employees and employers regarding leave benefits. The decision also underscores the importance of substantiating claims for tax exclusions with clear and accurate evidence.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.