Whiteley v. Commissioner, 42 B.T.A. 316 (1944)

The grantor of a trust is not taxed on the trust's income merely because they retain administrative powers as trustee, so long as they cannot alter, amend, revoke, or terminate the trust for their own benefit.

Summary

Whiteley created eight trusts for his children, naming himself trustee. The Commissioner argued that Whiteley's control over the trust assets made him the virtual owner, rendering the trust income taxable to him under Section 22(a). The Board of Tax Appeals disagreed, holding that Whiteley's powers were fiduciary in nature and not sufficient to treat him as the owner of the trust assets. Furthermore, the Board held that Section 134 of the Revenue Act of 1943 retroactively repealed the application of Helvering v. Stuart, providing relief to the petitioner.

Facts

J.O. Whiteley created eight trusts on December 8, 1931, one for each of his children. Whiteley served as the trustee for all trusts. The trust instruments gave Whiteley the power to manage the trust assets, including the right to vote shares of stock and sell trust assets. His wife, Lillian S. Whiteley, had the power to invest trust income and could use the income for the support, education, or maintenance of the children. Three trusts terminated during the tax years in question. The corpus and accumulated income were distributed to the beneficiaries when they reached the age of 21.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against Whiteley, including the net income of the eight trusts in Whiteley's individual income. Whiteley petitioned the Board of Tax Appeals for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Board of Tax Appeals reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the grantor's retention of certain powers as trustee caused the trust income to be taxable to him under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code?

2. Whether Section 134 of the Revenue Act of 1943 provided relief to the petitioner, even if the trust income would otherwise be taxable to him under the doctrine of Helvering v. Stuart?

Holding

1. No, because the powers retained by the grantor were administrative in character and exercised in a fiduciary capacity, not for his own benefit.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Yes, because Section 134 of the Revenue Act of 1943 retroactively repealed the application of Helvering v. Stuart, which would otherwise have taxed the grantor on the trust income.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the powers retained by Whiteley were administrative in nature and exercised in a fiduciary capacity. Whiteley did not have the power to alter, amend, revoke, or terminate the trusts, nor could he vest title to the corpus in himself. The court distinguished the case from *Helvering v. Clifford*, where the grantor retained significant control over the trust and its assets. The court emphasized that Whiteley's powers were those typically conferred upon a trustee and were not indicative of ownership. The court also noted that Section 134 of the Revenue Act of 1943 provided relief to the petitioner, even if the income of the trusts would otherwise be taxable to him under the doctrine of *Helvering v. Stuart*. Section 134 essentially provided that trust income would not be taxed to the grantor merely because it could be used for the support of a beneficiary whom the grantor is legally obligated to support, except to the extent it was actually so used.

The court stated: "Considering all the facts in the record, which we have endeavored to set forth fully in our findings of fact, we do not think there is any more reason to say that the income of the several trusts was taxable to the petitioner under section 22 (a) than there was in such recent cases decided by this Court as David Small, 3 T. C. 1142; Herbert T. Cherry, 3 T. C. 1171; and Estate of Benjamin Lowenstein, 3 T. C. 1133. Respondent's contention that the net income of the trusts is taxable to petitioner under section 22 (a) is not sustained."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the extent to which a grantor can act as trustee without being treated as the owner of the trust assets for tax purposes. It emphasizes that administrative powers, exercised in a fiduciary capacity, are generally permissible. However, the grantor must not retain powers that allow them to benefit personally from the trust or to alter the beneficial interests. This case also illustrates the retroactive effect of legislation intended to correct judicial interpretations of tax laws. Subsequent cases have relied on *Whiteley* to distinguish situations where the grantor's control is truly nominal from those where it amounts to beneficial ownership.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.