3 T.C. 991 (1944)

Income earned on assets held by a parent as a guardian for their children after the termination of a valid trust, where the assets irrevocably belong to the children, is not taxable to the parent.

Summary

Herbert Abraham established a trust for his minor children, accumulating income. Upon the trust's termination, he retained the accumulated income as "guardian" for the children, as stipulated in the trust instrument, with investment powers. The instrument stated the accumulations should "belong to the said children", and upon reaching the age of majority, the children would receive their share; if a child died before majority, the assets would go to the child's estate. The Tax Court held that the income from these accumulations was not includible in Abraham's taxable income because the funds irrevocably belonged to the children and he derived no economic benefit from the guardianship.

Facts

Herbert Abraham created an irrevocable trust in 1932 for his four minor children. The trust instrument gave the trustee (Abraham himself) the right to invest and reinvest the corpus and directed him to apply the income of the trust to the use of his children and accumulate the balance of such net income for the benefit of said children. The trust was to terminate five years from its date. Upon termination, accumulated income was to belong to the children, held and administered by the Trustee in the capacity of Guardian until they reached 21. If a child died before 21, their share went to their estate. The trust corpus reverted to Abraham upon termination.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies against Herbert Abraham, arguing that income from the trust accumulations after the trust terminated was taxable to him. Abraham challenged this assessment in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether income earned on assets held by Herbert Abraham after the termination of a trust, in his capacity as a self-appointed guardian for his children, is taxable to him, where the trust instrument stipulated that the accumulations irrevocably belonged to the children.

Holding

No, because Herbert Abraham held the assets as a guardian with limited powers and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

no economic benefit, and the trust instrument clearly stated that the accumulated income belonged to the children upon the trust's termination.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized that, upon the trust's termination, the accumulated income irrevocably became the property of the children. Abraham's role as "guardian" was limited to investment and reinvestment, with no power to use the income for his own benefit. The court distinguished this situation from cases where the grantor retained broad powers of control or could derive economic benefit from the trust assets. The court noted that the trust deed contained no provision for transferring the share of any child to petitioner at any time after the termination of the trust, and provided that in the event of death of any child after the termination of the trust and before reaching the age of 21, his or her "unapplied accumulations" were to become a part of the deceased beneficiary's estate. It distinguished this case from others, such as , where the grantor retained very broad powers of control and had a right to use and used funds of the trust to pay law school expenses of one of the beneficiaries. The Court stated, "Here the petitioner definitely provided that upon the termination of the original trust the accumulated income 'shall belong to the said children.'" Broad powers of management without any economic benefit do not bring a grantor within the provisions of section 22 (a).

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that when a trust terminates and assets are explicitly designated for the beneficiaries, the grantor's continued management of those assets in a fiduciary capacity does not automatically trigger taxation of the income to the grantor. The key is whether the grantor retains broad control or economic benefit. Attorneys drafting trust instruments should clearly delineate the beneficiaries' rights upon termination. This ruling highlights the importance of establishing a clear separation of ownership and control after trust termination to avoid grantor taxation. Later cases will distinguish based on the extent of the grantor's retained control and benefit.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.