

BORGE MICHAEL BETTY 010488 122801 CT APP

WISBAR

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS CASELAW



COURT OF APPEALS

DECISION

DATED AND FILED

December 28, 2001

Cornelia G. Clark

Clerk of Court of Appeals

NOTICE

This opinion is subject to further editing. If published, the official version will appear in the bound volume of the Official Reports.

A party may file with the Supreme Court a petition to review an adverse decision by the Court of Appeals. See Wis. Stat. § 808.10 and Rule 809.62.

Appeal No. 01-0488
STATE OF WISCONSIN

Cir. Ct. No. 00-CV-1633
IN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT IV

Michael Borge,
Petitioner-Appellant,
Betty C. Borge,
Petitioner-(In T.ct.),

v.

Wisconsin Tax Appeals Commission and Wisconsin

Department of Revenue,**Respondents-Respondents.**

APPEAL from an order of the circuit court for Dane County: GERALD C. NICHOL, Judge.
Affirmed.

Before Roggensack, Deininger and Lundsten, JJ.

¶1. ROGGENSACK, J. The issue presented on this appeal is whether distributions received by the shareholders of a mutual fund that invests in state and local bonds are included as taxable income for purposes of the Wisconsin income tax. We conclude that Wis. Stat. §71.05(6)(a)1 (1999-2000)¹ unambiguously requires taxpayers to include in their Wisconsin adjusted gross income "any interest ... which is not included in federal adjusted gross income." And, under 26 U.S.C. §§103(a) and 852(b) (5), the distributions at issue here are treated as "an item of interest" that is excluded from federal gross income. Accordingly, the distributions are subject to state taxation, and we affirm the order of the circuit court.

BACKGROUND

¶2. Michael and Betty Borge, residents of Wisconsin, held shares in mutual funds that invest in certain state and local bonds. The mutual funds receive interest payments on the bonds from the obligors, subtract expenses and management fees and then distribute the remaining interest payments to the fund shareholders. The Borge received such distributions each year from 1993 to 1996.

¶3. It is undisputed that the distributions from the Borge's state and local bond funds are tax-exempt for purposes of federal income tax. The Borge, however, also excluded the distributions from their Wisconsin adjusted gross income on their state income tax returns for 1993, 1994, 1995 and 1996. The Wisconsin Department of Revenue (DOR) adjusted the returns, asserting that the distributions were taxable under Wis. Stat. §71.05(6)(a)1. As a result of the adjustment, the Borge were assessed an additional \$5,735 in state taxes, interest and penalties.

¶4. The Borge appealed the DOR's determination that the distributions are taxable income. They argued that although Wis. Stat. §71.05(6)(a)1 expressly imposes state income tax on interest from the state and local bonds, the statute does not tax the distributions from their mutual funds, which they characterize as "dividends." The Wisconsin Tax Appeals Commission (Commission) rejected the Borge's argument and ruled that the DOR's determination was correct. The circuit court affirmed the Commission's decision, and Michael Borge appeals.

DISCUSSION

Standard of Review.

¶5. We review the decision of the Commission, not the decision of the circuit court. *Gilbert v. DOR*, 2001 WI App 153, ¶7, 246 Wis.2d 734, 633 N.W.2d 218. The Commission's decision turns on the construction of statutes. Statutory construction and the application of statutes to undisputed facts are questions of law. *Truttschel v. Martin*, 208 Wis.2d 361, 364-65, 560 N.W.2d 315, 317 (Ct. App.

1997). Although we are not bound by the Commission's legal conclusions, circumstances may warrant according some level of deference to the Commission. However, an administrative interpretation may be given deference only where there is an ambiguity in the statute. *Lincoln Sav. Bank, S.A. v. DOR*, 215 Wis.2d 430, 443, 573 N.W.2d 522, 528 (1998).

Statutory Interpretation.

¶6. In order to determine whether the distributions at issue are taxable income under Wisconsin law, we must (1) determine whether the item is included in or excluded from the federal definition of adjusted gross income, and (2) determine whether there is a state exception to the federal rule. This two-step inquiry is necessary because Wisconsin has "federalized" its basic definition of adjusted gross income for purposes of the state income tax. See *DOR v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, 2001 WI App 35, ¶9-13, 241 Wis. 2d 282, 625 N.W.2d 338 (noting similar "federalization" of the corporate franchise tax structure), *review denied*, 2001 WI 43, 242 Wis.2d 545, 629 N.W.2d 784. That is, the state legislature has provided that, with a few express exceptions, "'Wisconsin adjusted gross income' means federal adjusted gross income." Wis. Stat. §71.01(13).

¶7. Under federal law, interest earned on most state and local bonds is excluded from gross income. 26 U.S.C. § 103(a) (2000).² Section 852 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC) expressly sets forth the treatment of such tax-exempt interest when it is passed in the form of dividends to shareholders of regulated investment companies (*i.e.*, mutual funds):³

(5) Exempt-interest dividends. If, at the close of each quarter of its taxable year, at least 50 percent of the value (as defined in section 851(c)(4)) of the total assets of the regulated investment company consists of obligations described in section 103(a), such company shall be qualified to pay exempt-interest dividends, as defined herein, to its shareholders.

(A) Definition. An exempt-interest dividend means any dividend or part thereof (other than a capital gain dividend) paid by a regulated investment company and designated by it as an exempt-interest dividend in a written notice mailed to its shareholders

....

(B) Treatment of exempt-interest dividends by shareholders. An exempt-interest dividend shall be treated by the shareholders for all purposes of this subtitle as an item of interest excludable from gross income under section 103(a). Such purposes include but are not limited to-

(i) the determination of gross income and taxable income

26 U.S.C. §852(b)(5) (emphasis added).

¶8. Therefore, under 26 U.S.C. §852(b)(5), the distributions at issue are "exempt-interest dividends," and shareholders are to treat them as "an item of interest excludable from gross income" for purposes of federal taxation. And, because Wisconsin has federalized its definition of adjusted gross income, the relevant question becomes whether the state has enacted an exception that adds back this federally excluded "item of interest."

¶9. Wisconsin Stat. §71.05(6)(a)1 instructs state taxpayers in relevant part:

(a) *Additions*. To federal adjusted gross income add:

1. The amount of *any interest*, except interest under par. (b)1., less related expenses, *which is not included in federal adjusted gross income*

(Emphasis added.) The Commission concluded that because the IRC expressly denominates "exempt-interest dividends" as "an item of interest" excluded from federal adjusted gross income, the phrase "any interest ... which is not included in federal adjusted gross income" in §71.05(6)(a)1 must be read to include the distributions at issue. Borge contends that the term "interest," as used in §71.05(6)(a)1, does not encompass those distributions. In the alternative, he argues that §71.05(6)(a)1 is ambiguous and that it should be construed narrowly in his favor. We agree with the Commission.

¶10. When we construe a statute, our aim is to ascertain the intent of the legislature. *S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc. v. DOR*, 202 Wis.2d 714, 721, 552 N.W.2d 102, 105 (Ct. App. 1996). We begin with the language of the statute itself, looking not at isolated words or phrases, but at the meaning of the relevant language in the context of the entire statute. *Id.*; *Alberte v. Anew Health Care Servs., Inc.*, 2000 WI 7, ¶10, 232 Wis.2d 587, 605 N.W.2d 515. "If the language of the statute clearly and unambiguously sets forth the legislative intent, it is our duty to apply that intent to the case at hand and not look beyond the statutory language to ascertain its meaning." *Landis v. Physicians Ins. Co. of Wisconsin, Inc.*, 2001 WI 86, ¶14, 245 Wis.2d 1, 628 N.W.2d 893. However, if a statute is capable of being understood by reasonably well-informed persons in either of two senses, it is ambiguous and we will engage in judicial construction. *Id.* at ¶15.

¶11. In this case, the relevant language in Wis. Stat. §71.05(6)(a)1 provides that Wisconsin taxpayers are to add to their federal adjusted gross income "any interest ... which is not included in federal adjusted gross income." The plain meaning of this language requires taxpayers to determine the types of interest that are expressly excluded from federal adjusted gross income and then to add those items back into Wisconsin adjusted gross income unless they fall in one of the express exceptions. As explained above, 26 U.S.C. §852(b)(5), clearly states that exempt-interest dividends are to be treated as "an item of interest excludable from gross income under section 103(a)" for purposes of determining federal gross income. Wisconsin relies on the federal definition of adjusted gross income as its baseline definition of Wisconsin adjusted gross income, and, for that reason, the distributions at issue are a type of interest for purposes of §71.05(6)(a)1. Stated another way, the IRC excludes the distributions from taxable income as a type of interest, and §71.05(6)(a)1 unambiguously requires Wisconsin taxpayers to include in Wisconsin adjusted gross income (with a few exceptions not relevant here) all types of interest excluded for federal purposes.

¶12. Because we conclude that Wis. Stat. §71.05(6)(a)1 is not ambiguous, we apply its plain meaning to the facts of this case, and further conclude that Borge's distributions from mutual funds dealing in state and local bonds, although excludable as tax-exempt interest from federal gross income under 26 U.S.C. §§103(a) and 852(b)(5), are a type of interest that must be added to his Wisconsin income.

¶13. We reject Borge's argument that the distributions at issue and the underlying interest payments are so different in character that any attempt to tax the distributions as a form of interest would be nonsensical or, at the very least, lead to an ambiguity. First, Borge's argument ignores the plain meaning of the relevant language in Wis. Stat. §71.05(6)(a)1 and the federalization of the Wisconsin

Disclaimer of Liability

The State Bar of Wisconsin presents the information on this web site as a service to our members and other Internet users. While the information on this site is about legal issues, it is not legal advice. Moreover, due to the rapidly changing nature of the law and our reliance on information provided by outside sources, we make no warranty or guarantee concerning the accuracy or reliability of the content at this site or at other sites to which we link.

Terms and Conditions of Use