Hallowell v. Commissioner, 15 T.C. 1224 (1950)

A trust beneficiary with the unrestricted power to demand trust income is taxable on that income, even if the power is not exercised and the income is not actually received.

Summary

The Tax Court held that Blanche N. Hallowell was taxable on the income of two trusts because she had the unrestricted right to demand the income within thirty days after the end of each trust's fiscal year. Even though she did not request or receive the income, the court found that her power to command the income was equivalent to ownership for tax purposes, following the precedent set in *Mallinckrodt v. Commissioner*. The court reasoned that one cannot avoid taxation by forgoing access to funds that are readily available upon request.

Facts

Howard T. Hallowell created three trusts. Trusts Nos. 2 and 3 are at issue in the case. The trust indentures gave Blanche N. Hallowell, the beneficiary, the unrestricted right to demand the income of the trusts within thirty days after the expiration of each trust's fiscal year. The fiscal years for Trusts 2 and 3 ended on August 31 and October 31, respectively. Blanche N. Hallowell was on a calendar year basis for tax purposes. The trustee also had discretionary power to distribute income to Blanche N. Hallowell if he deemed it advisable. None of the income was actually distributed to Blanche during the tax years in question; it was retained by the trust and eventually would go to her grandchildren.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the income tax of Blanche N. Hallowell for the taxable years in question, arguing that the income from Trusts 2 and 3 was taxable to her. The Commissioner also argued, in a separate docket, that the income was taxable to the grantor of the trusts, Howard T. Hallowell, under the doctrine of *Helvering v. Clifford*. The Tax Court consolidated the cases to resolve the taxability of the trust income.

Issue(s)

Whether the income of Trusts Nos. 2 and 3 is taxable to Blanche N. Hallowell under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, given her unrestricted right to demand the income within thirty days after the close of each trust's fiscal year, even though she did not actually receive the income.

Holding

Yes, because Blanche N. Hallowell had the unrestricted right to receive the income

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

of the trusts, which is the equivalent of ownership of the income for purposes of taxation, regardless of whether she exercised that right.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court relied heavily on the precedent established in *Mallinckrodt v. Commissioner*, which held that a beneficiary with the power to receive trust income upon request is taxable on that income, even if it's not requested or received. The court cited *Corliss v. Bowers*, noting that "the income that is subject to a man's unfettered command and that he is free to enjoy at his own option may be taxed to him as his income, whether he sees fit to enjoy it or not." The court rejected the argument that the principle of *Mallinckrodt* was inapplicable because Blanche did not have the right to receive income during the trusts' fiscal years. The court emphasized that the key factor was her "unconditional power to receive the trust income" during her taxable year. The trustee's discretionary power to distribute income was deemed irrelevant, as it did not limit Blanche's ultimate power to demand the income. The court concluded that Blanche Hallowell was the owner of the income from the Hallowell trusts for purposes of Section 22(a). The existence of the power to demand income, not the actual receipt of it, triggered tax liability.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that control over income, even if unexercised, can trigger tax liability. It clarifies that the power to demand income is treated as the equivalent of ownership for tax purposes. Attorneys advising clients on trust arrangements must carefully consider the tax implications of granting beneficiaries the power to demand income. Taxpayers cannot avoid taxation by simply declining to exercise powers that give them dominion and control over trust assets. Later cases applying this ruling would likely focus on the extent and nature of the beneficiary's power to demand income. If the power is restricted or subject to significant conditions, the outcome might differ. This ruling impacts estate planning and trust administration, requiring careful drafting to avoid unintended tax consequences for beneficiaries with demand powers.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.