7 T.C. 1414 (1946)

For federal income tax purposes, the administration of an estate is deemed to end when the executor has performed all ordinary duties, regardless of whether the probate court has formally closed the estate.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether income from a decedent's estate was taxable to the estate or to the beneficiaries of a testamentary trust. The father of William Chick and Mabel Foss died in 1929, and William was named executor and trustee. By 1940, all claims against the estate were settled, but the residuary trust hadn't been formally set up. The Commissioner argued the estate administration had effectively ended, making the income taxable to the beneficiaries. The court agreed with the Commissioner, finding the estate was no longer in administration and the income was taxable to the beneficiaries under section 162(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Facts

Isaac W. Chick died in 1929, leaving a will naming his son, William C. Chick, as executor and trustee of several trusts, including one for the residue of the estate. William qualified as executor shortly after probate. The estate included 4,000 shares of John H. Pray & Sons Co. and 2,500 shares of Atlantic National Bank. By 1937, all claims against the estate were settled, but the residuary trust for William and his sister, Mabel C. Foss, was not formally established. William cited concerns about liabilities associated with the Pray & Sons stock as a reason for delaying the trust's setup. The Atlantic National Bank stock also became a liability when the bank closed in 1932 and a stockholder's liability was assessed.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined in 1940 that the estate was no longer in administration and assessed deficiencies against William and Mabel, arguing the estate income was taxable to them as beneficiaries of the residuary trust. William and Mabel challenged this determination in Tax Court. The cases were consolidated.

Issue(s)

Whether the income derived by the estate of Isaac W. Chick in 1940 was taxable to the estate or was currently distributable to William C. Chick and Mabel C. Foss as beneficiaries of a testamentary trust under section 162(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

Yes, because the estate of Isaac W. Chick was no longer in the process of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

administration in 1940, and the income was therefore taxable to William and Mabel as beneficiaries of the residuary trust.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on Regulation 103, Section 19.162-1, which states that the period of estate administration is the time required for the executor to perform ordinary duties like collecting assets, paying debts, and legacies. The court found that all necessary administrative acts had been completed by 1937 when the last claim against the estate was settled. The court rejected the argument that only a state probate court could determine when an administration is closed. The court distinguished the Fifth Circuit's reversal in *Frederich v. Commissioner*, disagreeing with any interpretation that would invalidate Regulation 103 as applied to the present facts. The court found William's reasons for delaying the trust's setup (concerns about Pray & Sons stock and his own illness) unpersuasive, noting he could have managed the stock as trustee and that the company's improved location didn't require any specific administrative action by the executor.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that the IRS isn't bound by the formal status of estate administration in state probate court when determining federal income tax liability. Attorneys must advise executors to promptly complete estate administration to avoid income being taxed to beneficiaries even if distributions haven't been made. The case highlights the importance of demonstrating a genuine, ongoing need for continued estate administration. Delaying estate closure solely for tax advantages is unlikely to succeed. Later cases have cited *Chick* for the principle that the determination of when an estate administration ends for tax purposes is a federal question, not solely determined by state law. The ruling impacts estate planning and administration, requiring careful attention to the timing of trust establishment relative to the completion of essential estate duties.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.