Bedford v. Commissioner, 150 F.2d 341 (1st Cir. 1945)

When a trust instrument gives the trustee discretion to allocate certain receipts to either income or principal, those receipts are not considered “income which is to be distributed currently” to the beneficiary until the trustee exercises that discretion.

Summary

The case addresses the taxability of trust income where the trustee has the discretion to allocate dividends from mines (or other wasting assets) to either income or principal. The First Circuit held that such dividends are not considered “income which is to be distributed currently” until the trustee actually exercises their discretion to allocate the funds to income. This means the beneficiary is not taxed on the income until the trustee makes the allocation decision. The key is the trustee’s discretionary power to determine what constitutes net income within the bounds of the trust document.

Facts

A testamentary trust was established, with the petitioner as the beneficiary entitled to the net income. The trust instrument granted the trustees the discretion to determine whether “dividends from mines or other wasting investments, and any extra or unusual dividends” should be treated as income or principal. During 1938, the trust received $1,903.83 in net receipts from dividends from mines. The trustees did not make a decision to treat these receipts as income until April 1, 1939.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the $1,903.83 in dividends should be included in the petitioner’s gross income for 1938. The Board of Tax Appeals initially ruled in favor of the taxpayer. The First Circuit reviewed the decision.

Issue(s)

Whether dividends from mines received by a trust in 1938, which the trustees had the discretion to allocate to either income or principal but did not allocate to income until 1939, were taxable to the beneficiary in 1938 as “income which is to be distributed currently”.

Holding

No, because the trustees had not exercised their discretion to allocate the dividends to income during 1938, the dividends were not considered “income which is to be distributed currently” and were therefore not taxable to the beneficiary in that year.

Court’s Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court emphasized that the trust instrument gave the trustees the power to decide what constituted net income. According to the will, dividends from mines were a special class of receipts subject to the trustees' discretion. Until the trustees exercised their discretion, the beneficiary had no present right to receive those dividends as income. The court distinguished this situation from cases where income is automatically distributable, stating that "The test of taxability to the beneficiary is not receipt of income, but the present right to receive it." However, in this case, no such present right existed until the trustees made their determination. The court referenced Section 162(b) of the Revenue Act of 1938, noting that it applied to income "which is to be distributed currently." Since the dividends were not yet designated as income, they did not fall under this section. The court also cited Section 162(c), which allows the fiduciary to deduct income that "in his discretion, may be either distributed or accumulated and which is by him 'properly paid or credited during such year' to a beneficiary." The court found this section inapplicable as well, since the dividends were not properly credited to the beneficiary during 1938 because the trustees had not yet decided to treat them as income. The court emphasized the importance of the trustee's decision-making role as outlined in the will: "The decision of my trustees as to what constitutes net income shall be final."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that when a trust document grants trustees discretion over the allocation of certain receipts, the timing of that decision is crucial for tax purposes. It provides a legal basis for trustees to delay the allocation decision to a subsequent tax year, affecting when the beneficiary is taxed on the income. Attorneys drafting trust documents should be aware of the tax implications of granting trustees such discretionary power. Later cases applying this ruling would likely focus on interpreting the specific language of the trust document to determine the scope of the trustee's discretion. This ruling highlights the importance of clear and precise language in trust instruments to avoid ambiguity regarding the allocation of income and principal, especially concerning wasting assets or unusual dividends. The case emphasizes the importance of the trustee's active decision-making role and its impact on the beneficiary's tax liability.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.