Hettler v. Commissioner, 5 T.C. 1079 (1945)

A transfer to a trust where the grantor retains the power to revest title in themselves is not subject to gift tax until that power is relinquished or terminated.

Summary

The Tax Court held that a transfer in trust was not subject to gift tax in 1934 because the grantor, Hettler, retained the power to revest title to the property in herself. Hettler and her son structured the trust with the understanding that he would default on annuity payments, thereby triggering a provision allowing her to terminate the trust. The court found that this arrangement effectively gave Hettler the power to revoke the trust at any time, bringing it within the exclusion of Section 501(c) of the Revenue Act of 1932. The intent and practical effect of the arrangement were critical to the court's decision.

Facts

Hettler transferred property, including stock in Herman H. Hettler Lumber Co. and real estate, into a trust in 1934. Her son was to make annuity payments of $25,000 per year to her. The lumber company had not declared dividends since 1929 and faced financial difficulties. Hettler and her son intended that he would default on the annuity payments almost immediately. The son's income was insufficient to make the annuity payments without invading the trust corpus, which was also not intended. The trust agreement terms combined with the son's financial situation created a situation where the mother could revest herself with the trust property immediately after the transfer.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the transfer in trust was an irrevocable gift subject to gift tax in 1934. Hettler petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination, arguing that the transfer was not complete for gift tax purposes because she retained the power to revest title in herself. The Tax Court reviewed the facts and circumstances surrounding the trust's creation.

Issue(s)

Whether the transfer in trust in 1934 was a completed gift subject to gift tax, given Hettler's contention that she retained the power to revest title to the property in herself due to the intended default on annuity payments.

Holding

No, because Hettler retained the power to revest title to the property in herself immediately after the transfer, making the transfer incomplete for gift tax purposes under Section 501(c) of the Revenue Act of 1932.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized the intent of Hettler and her son in structuring the trust. They found that the parties understood and expected an immediate default on the annuity payments, which would give Hettler the power to terminate the trust. The court noted that the son’s limited income and the lumber company’s financial struggles made it impossible for him to make the required payments. The court focused on Section 501(c) of the Revenue Act of 1932, which stated that a gift tax should not apply to a transfer where the power to revest title is retained by the donor. The court concluded that Hettler’s power to revest title meant the transfer was not complete for gift tax purposes in 1934. The court reasoned that the relinquishment or termination of such power would be considered a transfer by gift at the time of that later event. As the court stated, “The power to revest in the donor title to the property transferred in trust was vested in the donor immediately after the transfer. Section 501 (c) provides that under such circumstances the tax shall not apply…”

Practical Implications

This case illustrates that the substance of a transaction, including the intent of the parties and the practical realities of their situation, can override the formal terms of a trust agreement for gift tax purposes. It shows the importance of thoroughly documenting the grantor’s intent and the circumstances surrounding a trust’s creation. Attorneys should advise clients that retaining a power to revest title, even through indirect mechanisms, can defer gift tax liability until the power is relinquished. Later cases distinguish *Hettler* by focusing on whether the grantor truly and realistically retained control over the trust property. The case is a reminder that a mere possibility of revocation, without a clear and intended mechanism, is insufficient to avoid immediate gift tax consequences. Careful analysis of the grantor’s continued control and beneficial interest is necessary.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.