1 T.C. 228 (1942)

When trustees allocate proceeds from the sale of foreclosed property to income beneficiaries of a trust under state law (e.g., New York's Chapal-Otis rule), that allocation is taxable as income to the beneficiaries, even if the trust itself experienced a net loss on the sale.

Summary

Robert W. Johnston and T. Alice Klages were life income beneficiaries of trusts established by their mother. The trusts held a mortgage that went into default, leading to foreclosure. After the property was sold at a loss, the trustees, following New York law, allocated a portion of the proceeds to the beneficiaries as if it were interest income. The Tax Court held that this allocation was taxable income to the beneficiaries, even though the trust itself sustained a loss. The court also addressed the taxability of net income earned during a brief period before the sale and the applicable tax rates for nonresident aliens.

Facts

Caroline H. Field created inter vivos trusts in 1921 for her children, Robert W. Johnston and T. Alice Klages, granting them life income interests. A portion of the trusts' corpus included an undivided interest in a bond and mortgage. In 1932, the mortgage went into default, and the trustees foreclosed on the property. The trustees held the foreclosed property until January 11, 1937, when it was sold for cash and a purchase money bond and mortgage. The sale resulted in a loss. Under New York law, the trustees allocated a portion of the sale proceeds to the income beneficiaries to compensate them for lost interest income during the default period. The beneficiaries were nonresident aliens.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the petitioners' income tax for 1937, including in their income the allocated proceeds from the sale of the foreclosed property. The petitioners contested the deficiencies in the Tax Court. The cases were consolidated.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the portion of the proceeds from the sale of trust property allocated to the life income beneficiaries under New York law is includable in the beneficiaries' net income under Section 162(b) or 22(a) of the Revenue Act of 1936.

2. Whether the net income from the operation of the property for the period of January 1 to January 11, 1937, is includable in the beneficiaries' net income.

3. Whether the petitioners, as nonresident aliens, are subject to tax at the rates

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

imposed by Sections 11 and 12 of the Revenue Act of 1936.

Holding

1. Yes, because under New York law, the allocation represents a substitute for interest income that the beneficiaries would have received had the default not occurred. Therefore, this allocation is taxable to the beneficiaries as income under Section 162(b).

2. No, because under New York law, the net income from the property's operation before the sale was credited to principal and was not currently distributable to the beneficiaries.

3. Yes, because the aggregate amount received by each petitioner from sources within the United States exceeded $21,600, subjecting them to tax under Section 211(c) of the Revenue Act of 1936.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that under the *Chapal-Otis* rule of New York, the trustees were required to allocate a portion of the proceeds to the income beneficiaries to compensate for lost interest. Although the trust itself had a loss on the sale, the allocated amounts stood in lieu of interest and were therefore taxable as interest income to the beneficiaries. The court relied on *Theodore R. Plunkett, 41 B.T.A. 700*, which held that amounts allocated to a life income beneficiary to make up for losses due to improper trust investments were taxable as income. The court distinguished between mandatory and discretionary trusts, noting that since these were mandatory income trusts, the income was currently distributable. The court stated, "Although in reality there was no interest collected by the trusts and the amounts represented thereby did not represent taxable income to the trusts, nevertheless, under New York law, these amounts stood in lieu of interest and had to be passed on to petitioners, who were the income beneficiaries of the trusts. What was distributable to them was in lieu of interest and we think that which stands in lieu of interest must be taxed as interest." The court held the income earned from January 1-11 was not considered currently distributable and was used to reimburse the principal for foreclosure expenses, hence it should not be included as beneficiary income.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates how state law can impact the federal tax treatment of trust distributions. It emphasizes that even when a trust incurs a loss, allocations made to income beneficiaries under state law principles designed to compensate for lost income (like interest) are generally taxable to the beneficiaries as income. This case highlights the importance of considering the source and nature of trust distributions, rather than solely focusing on whether the trust itself had a profit or

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

loss. Later cases would cite this case to support the idea that state law determines what is distributable to trust beneficiaries. For estate planners, this case is a reminder to consider the tax consequences for beneficiaries when administering trusts, particularly those holding distressed assets that require special allocation rules.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.