6 T.C. 345 (1946)

A grantor is treated as the owner of a trust for income tax purposes when they retain substantial dominion and control over the trust, particularly when the beneficiaries are family members and the trust assets are invested in family-controlled entities.

Summary

The Tax Court held that the income from five trusts created by Henry and Clara Haldeman was taxable to them as grantors, rather than to the trusts or beneficiaries. The Haldemans created the trusts primarily for their daughter, Dayl, and invested the trust funds into family partnerships where the Haldemans maintained significant control. The court found that the Haldemans retained substantial dominion and control over the trust assets, and the arrangement lacked economic substance beyond tax avoidance. This triggered grantor trust rules, making the trust income taxable to the grantors.

Facts

Henry and Clara Haldeman created five trusts: two by Henry for Dayl, one by Clara for Dayl, one by Henry for Clara, and one by Henry as trustee. The beneficiaries were primarily Dayl and Clara, their daughter and wife, respectively. The trust indentures gave broad powers to the trustees, including the authority to invest in partnerships, even those in which the trustees were partners. All trust funds were invested in three partnerships where the Haldemans were general partners. The creation of these trusts did not significantly alter the Haldemans' management or control of their business interests.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies against Henry and Clara Haldeman, arguing that the income from the five trusts should be taxed to them as grantors. The Haldemans petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court reviewed the case.

Issue(s)

Whether the income of the trusts created by petitioners is taxable to them as grantors by reason of their alleged failure to completely divest themselves of control over trust corpus or income under Section 22(a) of the Revenue Acts of 1936 and 1938.

Holding

Yes, because the grantors retained substantial dominion and control over the trust corpus and income, and the creation of the trusts lacked economic substance beyond

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

tax avoidance.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the Haldemans retained substantial dominion and control over the trust assets. The family relationship between the grantors, trustees, and beneficiaries was a key factor. The court cited *Helvering v. Clifford*, emphasizing the need for special scrutiny when the grantor is the trustee and the beneficiaries are family members, to prevent the multiplication of economic units for tax purposes. The trust indentures specifically authorized the trustees to invest in partnership enterprises, even those in which they were partners. This gave the trustees dominion and control over trust property far exceeding normal fiduciary powers. The court found that the creation of the trusts did not affect the management and control by petitioners of the partnerships, making the trusts mere contrivances to avoid surtaxes. The court stated, “Considering the family relationship, the specific provisions of the trust indentures, the benefits flowing directly and indirectly to the petitioners, the other facts and circumstances in connection with the creation of the trusts and investment of trust funds, and the principles announced in the decided cases, we are convinced that the trusts created by petitioners were, for tax purposes, mere contrivances to avoid surtaxes.”

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of economic substance in trust arrangements, particularly when dealing with family members and family-controlled entities. It demonstrates that simply creating a trust does not automatically shift the tax burden. The grantor trust rules, as interpreted in *Helvering v. Clifford*, can be triggered when the grantor retains significant control or benefits from the trust assets. This case serves as a cautionary tale for taxpayers attempting to use trusts primarily for tax avoidance purposes. It emphasizes the need for a genuine transfer of control and benefit to the beneficiaries to avoid grantor trust status. Later cases have cited Haldeman as an example of how close family relationships and continued control by the grantor can lead to the trust income being taxed to the grantor.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.