6 T.C. 345 (1946)

A grantor is taxable on trust income under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code when the grantor retains substantial control over the trust and its income, particularly when the beneficiaries are family members and the trust assets are invested in entities controlled by the grantor.

Summary

Henry and Clara Haldeman created five family trusts, naming themselves as trustees and their minor daughter as the primary beneficiary. The trust assets were invested in partnerships controlled by the Haldemans. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued that the Haldemans should be taxed on the trust income because they retained substantial control over the trusts and the partnerships. The Tax Court agreed with the Commissioner, holding that the Haldemans were taxable on the trust income under Section 22(a) because the trusts were mere devices to reallocate income within a family group and avoid surtaxes. The court emphasized the broad powers retained by the grantors as trustees and their continued control over the underlying partnership businesses.

Facts

Henry and Clara Haldeman created five separate trusts: three with Henry as trustee and their daughter, Dayl, as beneficiary; one with Clara as trustee and Dayl as beneficiary; and one with Clara as trustor and Henry as trustee for Dayl. The trusts were funded with the Haldemans' separate property. The trust agreements gave the trustees broad powers of management and control, including the right to invest in general or limited partnerships, even if the trustee was also a partner. The trustees invested the trust corpora in partnerships in which the Haldemans were partners, individually. The income of these partnerships depended largely on the Haldemans' skill and ability.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Haldemans' income tax for 1937 and 1938, arguing that the trust income was taxable to them. The Haldemans petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court consolidated the cases and ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that the trust income was taxable to the Haldemans under Section 22(a) of the Revenue Acts of 1936 and 1938.

Issue(s)

Whether the income of the trusts established by the Haldemans is taxable to them as grantors under Section 22(a) of the Revenue Acts of 1936 and 1938 because they failed to completely divest themselves of control over the trust corpus or income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

Yes, because the Haldemans retained substantial control over the trusts and the trust income, making the trusts mere contrivances to avoid surtaxes, and therefore the trust income is taxable to them under Section 22(a).

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court relied on the Supreme Court's decision in *Helvering v. Clifford*, 309 U.S. 331 (1940), which held that a grantor is taxable on trust income when the grantor retains substantial control over the trust and its income. The court emphasized that special scrutiny is necessary when the grantor is the trustee and the beneficiaries are family members. The court noted that the Haldemans, as trustees, had broad powers of management and control over the trust assets, including the power to invest in partnerships in which they were also partners. The court also found that the creation of the trusts did not significantly alter the Haldemans' dominion and control over the property. The court concluded that, considering the family relationship, trust provisions, and benefits to the Haldemans, the trusts were mere tax avoidance devices. As Judge Hand stated in *Stix v. Commissioner*, 152 F.2d 562, the arrangement was "strangely suited to that purpose."

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the application of the grantor trust rules, specifically Section 22(a) (now Section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code), to family trusts. It highlights that simply creating a trust does not necessarily shift the tax burden from the grantor to the trust or its beneficiaries. The key factor is the degree of control retained by the grantor. Attorneys must carefully consider the grantor trust rules when advising clients on estate planning and trust creation, especially when family partnerships are involved. The case emphasizes that the IRS and courts will scrutinize arrangements where grantors retain significant control or benefit, particularly in intrafamily settings. Later cases have cited *Haldeman* for the principle that broad powers of control retained by a grantor-trustee can result in the trust income being taxed to the grantor, even if the trust is valid under state law. This case is a reminder that the economic substance of a transaction, not just its legal form, will determine its tax consequences.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.