7 T.C. 890 (1946)

A trust beneficiary, acting as sole trustee with unrestricted discretion to distribute trust income to themselves or another beneficiary, can be taxed on the entire trust income under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, regardless of whether they actually distribute it to themselves.

Summary

Eleanor Funk was the sole trustee of trusts established by her husband. The trust terms granted her absolute discretion to distribute income to herself or her husband based on their respective needs, of which she was the sole judge, or to accumulate the income. The Tax Court held that Eleanor Funk was taxable on the entire income of the trusts under Section 22(a), regardless of whether she distributed the income to herself. The court reasoned that her unfettered command over the trust income, akin to ownership, justified taxation under Section 22(a), which broadly defines gross income. This case clarifies that broad discretionary powers over trust income, even in a fiduciary role, can lead to taxability under general income definitions, not just specific trust taxation rules.

Facts

Wilfred Funk established four identical irrevocable trusts, naming his wife, Eleanor Funk, as the sole trustee for each. The corpus of each trust was 125 shares of Erwin Park, Inc. Class C stock. The trust deeds gave Eleanor, as trustee, the power to manage the trust assets, receive income, and pay trust expenses. Critically, she had the discretion to pay all or part of the net income annually to herself or her husband, Wilfred, based on their respective needs, of which she was the sole judge. Any undistributed income was to be accumulated and added to the principal. Letters exchanged between Wilfred and Eleanor confirmed her absolute discretion and lack of control by Wilfred. During the tax years in question (1938-1941), Erwin Park issued dividend checks to Eleanor as trustee. She deposited these funds, filed fiduciary tax returns, and paid taxes as trustee. In subsequent years, she distributed portions of the income to herself and her husband, accumulating the rest.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Eleanor Funk's income tax for 1938-1941, arguing she was taxable on the trust income. Eleanor Funk contested this, arguing she was taxable only as a fiduciary, not individually, on the undistributed income. The United States Tax Court heard the case to determine whether Eleanor was taxable under Section 22(a) on the income from these trusts.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Eleanor Funk, as the sole trustee of trusts with discretionary power to distribute income to herself or her husband, is taxable on the entire income of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the trusts under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, even if she does not distribute all the income to herself.

Holding

1. Yes, Eleanor Funk is taxable under Section 22(a) on the entire income of the trusts because she possessed such unfettered command over the income that it was essentially her own, regardless of whether she chose to distribute it to herself.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that while trust taxation rules (Sections 161 and 162) typically govern trust income taxability, Section 22(a)'s broad definition of gross income can apply when a beneficiary has such complete control over trust income that they are effectively the owner. The court distinguished between grantor trusts and beneficiary taxation, noting that for beneficiaries, the key is "unfettered command over the income or corpus of a trust." Citing precedent like *Mallinckrodt v. Nunan* and *Stix v. Commissioner*, the court emphasized that the right to acquire income at will, without needing concurrence from anyone else, makes the beneficiary taxable under Section 22(a). The court stated, "where 'the taxpayer beneficiary, acting alone, and without the concurrence of anyone else, had the right to acquire either the corpus or income of the trust at any time,' he was rightfully taxable as the owner of the income under section 22 (a)."

The court found that Eleanor Funk's powers as sole trustee gave her precisely this "unfettered command." The trust instrument gave her "unrestricted power…to distribute the income to herself personally." The letters between Eleanor and Wilfred further solidified this, emphasizing her sole discretion and lack of external control. The court dismissed the argument that her powers were limited by her fiduciary duty, stating that while a court of equity could intervene for bad faith, Eleanor failed to demonstrate any restriction significant enough to negate her absolute command over the income. The court concluded, "Without a showing of a minimum amount distributable to her husband, petitioner must be considered as having had absolute command over all of the income." Therefore, her control was deemed equivalent to ownership, making the trust income taxable to her under Section 22(a), and any distributions to her husband were considered gifts.

Practical Implications

Funk v. Commissioner establishes a significant principle: even when acting as a trustee, a beneficiary can be taxed on trust income under the broad scope of Section 22(a) if they possess virtually unrestricted control over that income. This case highlights that taxability is not solely determined by the formal structure of a trust or specific trust taxation statutes (like Sections 161 and 162). Instead, courts will look to the substance of the control exercised by the beneficiary. For legal

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

professionals, this means:

- When drafting trust instruments, carefully consider the scope of discretion granted to trustee-beneficiaries, especially regarding income distribution. Broad, unchecked discretion can lead to unintended tax consequences for the beneficiary.
- In advising clients, assess not just the trust document but also any side letters or understandings that might clarify or expand the trustee-beneficiary's control.
- When litigating similar cases, examine the degree of real control the beneficiary-trustee has. Can they essentially access the income at will? Are there meaningful constraints on their discretion enforceable by other beneficiaries or a court?
- This case serves as a reminder that general income tax principles under Section 22(a) can override or supplement specific trust taxation rules when the beneficiary's control over income resembles ownership.

Later cases have cited *Funk* in discussions of beneficiary control and the application of Section 22(a) in trust contexts, reinforcing the principle that substance over form governs when assessing income tax liability in trust arrangements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.