Harper v. Commissioner, 6 T.C. 230 (1946)

Under Internal Revenue Code Section 166, if a grantor's spouse has the power to revoke a trust containing community property under state law (California), and the spouse is deemed not to have a substantial adverse interest, the trust income is taxable to the grantors as community income.

Summary

The Harpers created trusts for their children using community property. The Commissioner argued that because Mrs. Harper never provided written consent as required under California community property law, she retained the power to revoke the trusts, making the trust income taxable to the Harpers under Section 166 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court agreed, holding that Mrs. Harper's lack of written consent meant she possessed a revocation power. Since she was not deemed to have a substantial adverse interest, the trust income was taxable to the Harpers as community income.

Facts

Mr. Harper transferred community property (stock) into trusts for their children. He executed a trust instrument, but Mrs. Harper never signed it, nor provided written consent for the transfer as required by California law for gifts of community property. The Commissioner determined that the trust income was taxable to the Harpers. The Harpers argued the trusts were valid and irrevocable and, therefore, taxable to the trusts themselves, not to them.

Procedural History

The Commissioner assessed a deficiency against the Harpers, arguing that the trust income was taxable to them. The Harpers petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination, contesting the deficiency. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, upholding the deficiency assessment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the income of trusts, funded with community property gifted by the husband without the wife's written consent, is taxable to the grantors under Section 166 of the Internal Revenue Code, given that under California law, the wife retains the power to revoke the gift.

Holding

1. Yes, because Mrs. Harper, lacking written consent as required by California law, retained the power to revoke the trusts and reinstate the property as community property. Under Section 166, since she did not have a substantial adverse interest, the income was taxable to the Harpers.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court focused on Section 166 of the Internal Revenue Code, which taxes trust income to the grantor if a non-adverse party has the power to revest title to the trust corpus in the grantor. The court analyzed California community property law, specifically Section 172 of the Civil Code, which requires a wife’s written consent for a husband to make a gift of community property. Without that consent, the gift is voidable at the wife’s option. The court stated: “Where a husband makes a gift of community property without the written consent of the wife, section 172 does not make the gift void, but merely voidable at the option of the wife.” The court rejected the Harpers’ argument that Mrs. Harper’s knowledge of the gifts and omission of the trust income from her tax return constituted ratification or estoppel. The court distinguished *Lahaney v. Lahaney* because in that case the wife had directly benefitted from the deed, whereas Mrs. Harper received nothing directly from the trust instrument. The court concluded that Mrs. Harper retained the power to revoke the trusts and, thus, the income was taxable to the Harpers under Section 166. The court found it unnecessary to address arguments under Sections 22(a) and 167. There were no dissenting or concurring opinions noted.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of complying with state community property laws when creating trusts. Specifically, it underscores that failure to obtain proper written consent from a spouse can result in adverse tax consequences. Practitioners in community property states must ensure that both spouses consent in writing to any transfers of community property to trusts to avoid the grantor being taxed on the trust income under Section 166. The case also serves as a reminder that merely knowing about a transfer and not reporting the income is insufficient to constitute ratification or estoppel for tax purposes. This ruling impacts how estate planning is conducted in community property states, emphasizing the need for meticulous adherence to state law requirements. Later cases may cite this case to reinforce the significance of adhering to state law requirements, particularly community property laws, to achieve desired tax outcomes in trust arrangements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.