7 T.C. 255 (1946)

The exercise or release of a power of appointment is not considered a transfer of property subject to gift tax unless explicitly provided by statute, and amendments to gift tax law are not retroactively applied without express provisions.

Summary

Mabel Grasselli was granted a power of appointment over a trust created by her husband. She was not a trustee but had the power to alter, amend, or terminate the trust. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Grasselli's gift tax for the years 1936-1941, arguing that income paid to other beneficiaries and her actions to divide the trust corpus in 1941 constituted taxable gifts. The Tax Court held that the amendments made by the Revenue Act of 1942, which treated the exercise or release of a power of appointment as a transfer of property, did not apply retroactively to Grasselli's actions before January 1, 1943. Therefore, Grasselli was not subject to gift tax.

Facts

- In 1932, Grasselli's husband established an irrevocable trust, with Grasselli as a beneficiary, not a trustee.
- The trust provided that Grasselli could alter, amend, or terminate the trust, directing the trustee to distribute the principal to herself or others (excluding the settlor).
- From 1936 to July 30, 1941, the trust income was distributed with 50% to Grasselli, 30% to her son, and 20% to her daughter, as specified in the trust instrument.
- On July 30, 1941, Grasselli amended the trust to divide the corpus into three funds (A, B, and C). Funds A and B went to her children, and fund C provided income to Grasselli for life. She relinquished control over funds A and B.
- On March 3, 1942, Grasselli changed the beneficiaries of fund C.

Procedural History

The Commissioner assessed gift tax deficiencies against Grasselli for 1936-1941. Grasselli challenged the deficiency determination in the Tax Court. The Tax Court considered whether the income payments to beneficiaries and the 1941 trust division were taxable gifts.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the amendments to gift tax law by section 452 of the Revenue Act of 1942 can be retroactively applied to the taxable years 1936 to 1941.
2. Whether, prior to July 30, 1941, Grasselli was subject to gift tax on amounts paid to beneficiaries other than herself by the trustee under a trust where she held a power of appointment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

3. Whether Grasselli was subject to gift tax due to her action on July 30, 1941, dividing the trust into three funds under her power of appointment.

Holding

1. No, because Section 451 of the Revenue Act of 1942 states that amendments are applicable only to gifts made in calendar year 1943 and succeeding years, unless otherwise expressly provided.
2. No, because prior to the 1942 amendments, the exercise of a power of appointment did not automatically trigger gift tax liability; there was no taxable transfer of property.
3. No, because Grasselli's actions on July 30, 1941, were akin to a release of her power of appointment over funds A and B, which was not subject to gift tax under the existing laws.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the amendments made by section 452 of the Revenue Act of 1942, which deemed the exercise or release of a power of appointment as a transfer of property, were not intended to be retroactively applied. The court cited section 451 of the same act, which stated that the amendments were applicable only to gifts made in 1943 and subsequent years, unless expressly provided otherwise. The court found no express provision applying the amendments to exercises of power before 1943.

The Court cited *Sanford's Estate v. Commissioner, 308 U.S. 39* to support that exercise of power, even by the donor, doesn't cause gift tax prior to relinquishment of that power. The court also relied on *Edith Evelyn Clark, 47 B.T.A. 865*, which held that relinquishment of a power didn't entail a gift tax because no property was transferred.

Regarding the income payments to other beneficiaries before July 30, 1941, the court held that Grasselli's inaction in not altering the trust's distribution scheme did not constitute a taxable gift, as the beneficiaries were already entitled to the income under the trust instrument. The court distinguished *Richardson v. Commissioner, 151 Fed. (2d) 102*, because in this case, Grasselli was not a trustee who actively distributed the income; instead, the payments were made by the trustee according to the trust terms, and Grasselli merely refrained from exercising her power to change the distribution.

Practical Implications

Grasselli v. Commissioner clarifies that gift tax laws regarding powers of appointment must be explicitly stated to be retroactive. The case emphasizes that the mere existence of a power of appointment, and even its exercise, does not automatically trigger gift tax liability unless specifically mandated by statute. It

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

highlights the distinction between the exercise and release of powers, particularly in the context of trust modifications. For tax attorneys, it underscores the importance of carefully examining the effective dates of tax law amendments and the specific actions taken by the power holder to determine gift tax consequences. Later cases would need to consider if the power was released or exercised.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.