T.C. Memo. 1944-402 (1944)

A trustee who is compelled to make payments to a trust beneficiary due to the breach of trust by a co-trustee can deduct the payment as a bad debt when the co-trustee, primarily liable for the breach, is insolvent and unable to reimburse the paying trustee.

Summary

Trimble, a co-trustee, sought to deduct a payment he made to a trust beneficiary following a breach of trust by his co-trustee, Jacobs, who had misappropriated trust funds. The Tax Court allowed the deduction, reasoning that Jacobs was indebted to Trimble for the amount Trimble paid to the beneficiary because Jacobs received the full benefit of the misappropriated funds and was primarily responsible for restoring them. Since Jacobs was insolvent in the year Trimble made the payment, the debt became worthless, entitling Trimble to a bad debt deduction under Section 23(k)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Facts

1. Trimble and Jacobs were co-trustees of a trust.
2. Jacobs withdrew funds from the trust.
3. Jacobs agreed to restore the funds, and Trimble believed Jacobs had sufficient property to do so.
4. Jacobs failed to restore the funds, constituting a breach of trust.
5. Trimble made a payment of $5,934.07 in 1941 to the guardian of the trust beneficiary as part of a settlement approved by the Superior Court of California, discharging his liability as co-trustee.
6. Jacobs was insolvent in 1941.

Procedural History

1. Trimble claimed a deduction on his 1941 tax return for the payment made to the trust beneficiary, asserting it was a bad debt.
2. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction.
3. Trimble appealed to the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Jacobs' failure to restore the misappropriated trust funds created a valid indebtedness from Jacobs to Trimble.
2. Whether the indebtedness, if it existed, became worthless in 1941, the year Trimble made the payment to the beneficiary.

Holding

1. Yes, because Jacobs received the full benefit from the breach of trust and was

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

therefore obligated to make contribution to Trimble, his co-trustee, to the extent of the benefit he received.
2. Yes, because Jacobs was insolvent in 1941, rendering the debt uncollectible.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that Jacobs was primarily liable for the breach of trust since he misappropriated the funds and received the benefit. Trimble, at most, was only negligent in trusting Jacobs' ability to repay. Applying principles of trust law, particularly the Restatement of Trusts, the court found that Jacobs had an obligation to contribute to Trimble for the amount Trimble paid to the beneficiary. The court cited Restatement of the Law of Trusts, vol. 1, pp. 801-804, ¶258 (d) and (f), and In re Whitney's Estate, 11 Pac. (2d) 1107, 1111, to support the principle of contribution among co-trustees where one is substantially more at fault. Since Jacobs was insolvent in 1941, the debt became worthless in that year. The court distinguished this situation from a voluntary loan that is worthless when made, stating, "Where the debt is created involuntarily the foregoing rule does not apply and the taxpayer may be allowed a bad debt deduction, the worthlessness of his claim being in fact the element justifying his right to the deduction. This rule finds illustration in the cases of an endorsement or the assumption of the obligation by a surety." The court relied on Shiman v. Comm., 60 Fed. (2d) 65, emphasizing that the debt arises only when the paying party pays because the prior obligor is unable to do so.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that a trustee who makes payments to cover the liability of a co-trustee who breached the trust can establish a debtor-creditor relationship, which can then lead to a bad debt deduction. It emphasizes that the key is the primary liability of the breaching co-trustee and their subsequent inability to reimburse the paying trustee. This decision provides guidance for similar situations where individuals are jointly liable for obligations, and one party ends up bearing a disproportionate share due to the default of the other. It also illustrates an exception to the general rule that a debt must have value when acquired to be deductible; debts arising involuntarily, such as from surety relationships or co-trustee liabilities, can be deductible even if the primary obligor is already in a precarious financial situation. Attorneys should analyze the relative fault and benefit received by each party when determining the deductibility of payments made under joint liability situations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.