

4 T.C. 208 (1944)

Trust income is taxable to the grantor if it may be used for the maintenance, support, or welfare of the grantor's minor children, regardless of whether it is actually used for that purpose.

Summary

The petitioner, Knox, created a trust for the benefit of his minor children. The trustee had discretion to use the trust income for the children's maintenance, support, and welfare. The Tax Court held that the trust income was taxable to Knox, the grantor, even though the income was not actually used for the children's support. The court reasoned that the mere possibility of such use was sufficient to attribute the income to the grantor under Section 167(a)(2) of the Revenue Act of 1936, aligning with the Supreme Court's decision in *Helvering v. Stuart*.

Facts

Knox created a trust with the stated purpose of providing for the maintenance, support, and welfare of his minor children. The trust instrument granted the trustee broad discretion to distribute the trust income to or for the benefit of the children. No part of the trust income was actually used to provide for the maintenance and support of the children during the tax year in question.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the trust income was taxable to Knox. Knox petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination. The Tax Court, after considering supplemental briefs in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Helvering v. Stuart*, upheld the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the income from a trust created by a grantor for the benefit of his minor children is taxable to the grantor when the trustee has the discretion to use the income for the children's maintenance, support, and welfare, even if the income is not actually used for that purpose.

Holding

Yes, because the possibility that the trust income could be used to relieve the grantor of his parental duty to support his minor children is sufficient to attribute the trust income to the grantor for tax purposes under Section 167(a)(2) of the Revenue Act of 1936.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court relied heavily on the Supreme Court's decision in *Helvering v. Stuart*, which addressed similar trust arrangements. The court found no essential distinction between the Knox trust and the trusts in *Stuart*. The court emphasized that the trustee's "untrammelled discretion" to use the income for the children's benefit was crucial. Even though the income was not actually used for support, the mere possibility of such use was enough to trigger the attribution rule. The court quoted Section 167(a)(2) of the Revenue Act of 1936, which attributes trust income to the grantor when it "may, in the discretion of the grantor or of any person not having a substantial adverse interest in the disposition of such part of the income, be distributed to the grantor." The court reasoned that by using the income for the children's support, the trustee would be constructively distributing the income to the grantor by relieving him of his parental obligations. The court specifically noted that the duty of the trustee was to pay the net income "to or for the benefit of the Grantor's children."

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that a grantor cannot avoid tax liability on trust income if the trust terms allow the income to be used to fulfill the grantor's legal obligations, particularly the support of minor children. Attorneys drafting trust documents must carefully consider the potential tax consequences of granting trustees broad discretion over income distribution. This ruling highlights that even if the income is not actually used for the grantor's benefit, the mere possibility of such use is sufficient to trigger the grantor trust rules and attribute the income to the grantor. Later cases applying this ruling focus on the degree of discretion granted to the trustee and whether that discretion could potentially relieve the grantor of a legal obligation.