8 T.C. 237 (1947)

A grantor's power to alter or amend a trust for estate tax purposes is limited by the terms of the trust agreement, and attempts to change beneficial interests beyond those reserved powers are ineffective.

Summary

The Estate of John W. Neal challenged a deficiency in estate taxes, arguing that the value of a trust created by the decedent should not be included in his gross estate. The trust agreement allowed the grantor to modify or amend the agreement, but not to change beneficial interests. The Commissioner argued that the grantor's amendments materially changed the beneficial interests and thus the trust assets should be included in the estate under Section 811(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court held that the grantor's power to amend was limited by the original trust agreement and that the amendments attempting to change beneficial interests were a nullity, thus the trust assets were not includible in the gross estate.

Facts

In 1929, John W. Neal created an irrevocable trust funded with community property. The trust was for the benefit of his three grandchildren, with income to be accumulated until age 21, then paid for life. Upon each grandchild's death, the principal was to be distributed as appointed in their will, or in default of appointment, to their lineal descendants, or specified remaindermen. The trust agreement's Article Seventh reserved to the grantor the power to modify, alter, or amend the agreement, but specifically denied him the power to change any of the beneficial interests.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the estate tax. The estate petitioned the Tax Court contesting the inclusion of the trust assets in the gross estate. Initially, the Commissioner argued that the trust was includible under Section 811(c) and (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, but later conceded the argument under Section 811(c), proceeding solely under Section 811(d)(2).

Issue(s)

1. Whether the decedent retained the power to alter or amend the trust agreement of July 8, 1929, to the extent that the beneficial interests were materially changed, thus requiring inclusion of the trust assets in the gross estate under Section 811(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the grantor's power to amend the trust was limited by the original

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

trust agreement, which expressly prohibited changes to beneficial interests.

Court's Reasoning

The court emphasized that Article Seventh of the trust agreement reserved the power to modify, alter, or amend the agreement, but expressly denied the power to change the beneficial interests. The court examined several amendments made by the grantor. The court found amendments relating to the trustee's accounts and investment directions were administrative and did not affect the enjoyment of the trust properties, citing *Dort v. Helvering* and *Estate of Henry S. Downe*. The court then focused on the 1936 amendment, which attempted to remove the grandchildren's power of appointment. Citing *Schoellkopf v. Marine Trust Co.*, the court defined "beneficial interest" broadly and found that the 1936 amendment did materially change the grandchildren's beneficial interests. However, because the original trust agreement prohibited such changes, the court deemed the 1936 amendment a nullity, citing *Guitar Trust Estate v. Commissioner* and *Boyd v. United States*. The court reasoned that a trust settlor can only exercise powers of amendment expressly reserved in the original trust instrument. The court stated, "After it took effect they had no right or interest save as fixed by the deed."
Therefore, since the decedent did not have the power to change the enjoyment of the trust assets at the time of his death, the corpus of the trust was not includible in the gross estate under Section 811(d)(2).

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of carefully drafting trust agreements to clearly define the grantor's powers to amend or modify the trust. It reinforces the principle that a grantor's powers are limited to those expressly reserved in the original instrument. Attorneys drafting trusts must ensure that any reserved powers are narrowly tailored to avoid unintended estate tax consequences. This case also serves as a reminder that subsequent actions or expressed intent by the grantor cannot expand powers not originally reserved in the trust agreement. The *Estate of Neal* ruling informs the analysis of similar cases involving irrevocable trusts and the extent to which a grantor's retained powers may trigger inclusion in the gross estate.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.