Estate of Hazelton, 6 T.C. 624 (1946)

A transfer of property is not considered to be intended to take effect at death if the decedent had no such intention, the death had no possible effect on the possession or enjoyment of the property, and the transfer took effect immediately as an irrevocable gift.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether a transfer of funds to an insurance company for the benefit of the decedent's grandchildren, with a reversionary clause if all grandchildren died before reaching age 21, should be included in the decedent's gross estate under Section 811(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court held that the transfer was not intended to take effect at death, as the decedent's death did not affect the beneficiaries' possession or enjoyment of the property, and the transfer was designed to be an immediate, irrevocable gift.

Facts

The decedent deposited money with an insurance company to benefit her living and future grandchildren, with distributions of income to begin as each grandchild reached age 21. Upon a grandchild's death after age 21, their share would vest in their estate. If a grandchild died before age 21, their share would augment the shares of the surviving grandchildren. A clause stipulated that if all grandchildren died before the youngest reached 21, the remaining funds would revert to the decedent or her estate. At the time of deposit, she had five grandchildren. At the time of death, she had six grandchildren, two of whom were over 21.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue sought to include the value of the transferred property in the decedent's gross estate, arguing it was a transfer intended to take effect at death. The Tax Court was petitioned to resolve the dispute over the estate tax deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether the transfer of funds to the insurance company for the benefit of the decedent's grandchildren was intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after the decedent's death, thereby making it includible in the gross estate under Section 811(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the decedent did not intend the transfer to take effect at death. The decedent's death had no impact on the beneficiaries' possession or enjoyment of the property, and the transfer was designed to be an immediate, irrevocable gift to her

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

grandchildren.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the decedent intended an immediate, irrevocable transfer upon depositing the funds with the insurance company. The court emphasized that a portion of the property vested irrevocably before her death and that all of it could have vested had she lived longer. The court distinguished this case from Helvering v. Hallock, stating that the decedent’s actions were not akin to a testamentary disposition. The court noted, “To hold that decedent in the instant case intended that the transfer should take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death would be to do violence to the meaning of the word “intended,” for the decedent quite clearly had no such thing in mind… Her death could have had no possible effect upon the possession or enjoyment of the property transferred. Certainly, she had this in mind when the transfer was made.”

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that transfers with reversionary interests are not automatically included in the gross estate if the transferor intended an immediate gift and their death does not directly affect the beneficiaries’ enjoyment of the property. The key factor is the transferor’s intent and the actual effect of their death on the transfer. Estate planners should carefully document the transferor’s intent to make an immediate gift. Later cases will distinguish Hazelton by focusing on the degree of control retained by the transferor and the extent to which the transferor’s death was a necessary condition for the beneficiaries to fully enjoy the property. This case serves as a reminder that the presence of a reversionary interest, by itself, does not trigger inclusion in the gross estate under Section 2037 (the successor to 811(c)); the *intent* and *effect* of the transfer are paramount.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.