1 T.C. 310 (1942)

Income derived from oil and gas leases in a separate property state, acquired by a husband domiciled in a community property state using funds advanced on his personal credit, is taxable entirely to the husband.

Summary

E.T. Noble, domiciled in Oklahoma (a non-community property state), acquired oil and gas leases in Texas (a community property state) partly with funds advanced by his law partner on Noble's personal credit and partly from the income of those leases. The Tax Court addressed whether half of the income from these leases could be reported by Noble's wife, Coral. The court held that because the income was derived from property acquired through Noble's credit and later income, it was taxable entirely to him, upholding deficiencies against E.T. Noble's estate and negating deficiencies against Coral Noble.

Facts

E.T. Noble and his wife, Coral, resided in Oklahoma. Noble, an attorney, also had extensive experience in the oil industry. In 1930, Noble's law partner, Cochran, advanced him funds to invest in Texas oil leases, specifically the Muckelroy lease, on Noble's personal credit because Cochran valued Noble's expertise. The lease proved profitable, and further Texas oil leases were acquired. The initial advances from Cochran were eventually repaid from Noble's share of the oil production. Noble occasionally visited Texas to oversee the leases.

Procedural History

E.T. Noble and Coral L. Noble filed separate income tax returns for 1936 and 1937. E.T. Noble reported all the net income from the Texas oil leases. The IRS determined deficiencies against E.T. Noble, which he contested, claiming half of the income should have been reported by Coral. Consequently, the IRS also assessed deficiencies against Coral L. Noble. The Tax Court consolidated the cases.

Issue(s)

Whether E.T. Noble and Coral L. Noble, husband and wife domiciled in a non-community property state (Oklahoma), could each report one-half of the net income from oil leases in a community property state (Texas) when the leases were acquired using funds advanced on the husband's personal credit and from income derived from the leases.

Holding

No, because the income from the oil leases was derived from property acquired through E.T. Noble's credit and later income, it was taxable entirely to him, not as

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

community property split between him and his wife.

Court’s Reasoning

The court emphasized that since the Nobles were domiciled in Oklahoma, a non-community property state, the earnings of the husband and income from his separate property were taxable to him alone. The court distinguished this case from *Hammonds v. Commissioner*, where the wife’s personal services contributed to acquiring the leases. Here, Noble paid the same amount for his interest as Cochran, his partner, and while Noble made some trips to Texas, these efforts did not equate to contributing personal services as consideration for the leases. The court stated, “Since it appears that Noble paid the same amount for his interest in the Texas leases as Cochran did, we do not think that there is any ground for contending that a part of the consideration paid by Noble was personal services rendered.” The court also noted that the general rule against giving community property laws extraterritorial effect applied. The court cited *Commissioner v. Skaggs*, which held that the law of the state where real property is located controls its income tax treatment, regardless of the owner’s domicile.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that the domicile of the taxpayer is crucial in determining the taxability of income, even when the income-producing property is located in a community property state. It reinforces the principle that income from separate property remains taxable to the owner of that property, particularly when the property was acquired through personal credit and later income. It limits the potential for taxpayers in non-community property states to claim community property benefits for assets held in community property states. The case illustrates that merely owning property in a community property state does not automatically convert income from that property into community income, particularly when the acquisition is financed through separate credit. Subsequent cases would need to carefully examine the source of funds and the nature of any personal services rendered in acquiring property across state lines.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.