5 T.C. 1346 (1945)

Payments received as installments from a life insurance policy are not taxable, while payments received as income from a testamentary trust are taxable as income and not as a gift or bequest.

Summary

The case addresses two distinct tax issues: whether installment payments from a life insurance policy are taxable income, and whether monthly payments received from a testator's estate during administration are taxable income. The court held, following precedent, that life insurance installment payments are not taxable. However, the court determined that the monthly payments from the estate, designed to be charged against the recipient's share of estate income, were indeed taxable income, distinguishing them from a bequest or annuity paid from the estate's corpus.

Facts

Lola G. Bullard was the beneficiary of a life insurance policy and the testator's will. After the insured's death, she elected to receive the life insurance proceeds in installments. The will provided that Bullard receive monthly payments of $2,000 from the estate until she received her full income share from the residuary estate, with these payments to be charged against her share of the estate income.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against Bullard, arguing that both the life insurance installments and the monthly payments from the estate were taxable income. Bullard petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether installment payments received from a life insurance policy are taxable income to the recipient.
2. Whether monthly payments received from a testator's estate, designated to be charged against the recipient's share of estate income, constitute taxable income or a tax-exempt bequest.

Holding

1. No, because prior precedent in *Commissioner v. Pierce* held that such installment payments are not taxable.
2. Yes, because the payments were specifically designated to be paid from and charged against the petitioner's share of the income from the estate, making them taxable income under the principles of *Irwin v. Gavit*.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

Regarding the life insurance installments, the court deferred to the Second Circuit’s decision in *Commissioner v. Pierce*, which held that such payments are not taxable. The court acknowledged the Commissioner’s disagreement with the *Pierce* decision but followed it as binding precedent. As to the estate payments, the court interpreted the will to determine the testator’s intent. It concluded that the testator intended for the monthly payments to be an advance on Bullard’s share of the estate’s income, designed to provide her with income during the estate’s administration. The court distinguished *Burnet v. Whitehouse*, noting that in *Whitehouse*, the annuity was chargeable against the corpus of the estate, whereas in this case, the payments were explicitly charged against the income. The court found *Irwin v. Gavit* more applicable, where payments from trust income were deemed taxable income, not a tax-exempt bequest. The court reasoned that the testator’s intent was to “preserve the principal intact until the petitioner’s death and to limit the petitioner’s rights as beneficiary to the income to be derived from that principal.”

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the tax treatment of different types of payments received from estates and insurance policies. It emphasizes the importance of the source of the payment and the testator’s intent as expressed in the will. If payments are intended as distributions of estate income, they are likely to be taxed as income to the recipient. If the payments are from the insurance policy’s principal, and paid as installments based on an election, they are not taxable. This ruling informs how estate plans are drafted and how beneficiaries structure their receipt of assets to minimize tax liabilities. Later cases would distinguish this ruling by analyzing the source and purpose of the payment based on specific language in the testamentary documents.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.