6 T.C. 159 (1946)

r
r

Transfers of property made pursuant to a divorce settlement, representing a bargained-for exchange to settle support obligations rather than a donative intent, are not subject to gift tax.

r
r

Summary

r

Clarence Mitchell transferred property to his wife, both directly and via a trust, as part of a divorce settlement. The Tax Court addressed whether these transfers, specifically those intended to discharge his support obligations, constituted taxable gifts. The court held that transfers made in the context of a divorce settlement, representing a bargained-for exchange to settle support obligations and lacking donative intent, are not subject to gift tax. This decision emphasizes the arm's-length nature of divorce settlements where parties seek to resolve financial obligations.

r
r

Facts

r

Clarence Mitchell and his wife, Marjorie, separated in 1940. Mitchell intended to divorce and remarry. Negotiations ensued regarding alimony and support, with Marjorie's father actively participating and demanding a substantial share of Mitchell's assets. Ultimately, they agreed that Mitchell would transfer the family home, certain household goods, and an insurance policy to Marjorie outright. He would also transfer 50% of his other property (securities) into a trust, with income to Marjorie for life and the corpus to their children upon her death or when the youngest reached 25. This agreement released Mitchell from future support obligations and was intended to settle all property rights.

r
r

Procedural History

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

r

Mitchell filed a gift tax return, reporting the remainder interest transferred to his children as a taxable gift. He did not include the value of the property transferred to his wife. The Commissioner determined a deficiency, including the value of the property given to the wife as a taxable gift. Mitchell contested the deficiency, arguing the transfers were part of a divorce settlement, not gifts. The Commissioner then filed an amended answer seeking an increased deficiency. The Tax Court addressed the issue.

r
r

Issue(s)

r

Whether transfers of property, both outright and in trust, made pursuant to a divorce settlement to discharge a husband's obligation to support his wife, constitute taxable gifts under federal gift tax laws.

r
r

Holding

r

No, because the transfers were made in the ordinary course of business, at arm's length, and free from donative intent, to settle marital obligations in a divorce agreement and thus represent a bargained-for exchange rather than a gift.

r
r

Court's Reasoning

r

The Tax Court emphasized that the transfers were part of an arm's-length transaction aimed at settling support obligations, not a gratuitous transfer motivated by donative intent. The court highlighted that Mitchell received a tangible benefit in the form of release from his legal duty to support his wife, a duty that carries significant legal and financial implications. The court distinguished the case from situations involving donative transfers, pointing out that the negotiations involved careful consideration of Marjorie's financial needs, Mitchell's income, and the amount of principal required to generate sufficient income. Citing *Herbert Jones, 1*

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

T.C. 1207 and *Edmund C. Converse, 5 T.C. 1014*, the court reiterated its position that settlements resolving support obligations lack the donative intent necessary to trigger gift tax liability. As the court stated, “By obtaining the discharge of this legal obligation, the petitioner was relieved of making continuing cash expenditures for years to come. This, in our opinion, constitutes consideration in money or money’s worth…and in no sense represents a gift.”

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.