Wright v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1944-259

A compromise of a property settlement arising from a divorce decree is generally not deductible as a loss or bad debt unless a pre-existing, demonstrable legal obligation existed outside of the marital agreement.

Summary

The petitioner sought to deduct the value of stock she did not receive in a compromise of a property settlement with her former husband as either a loss or a bad debt. The Tax Court denied the deduction, finding that the agreement to deliver the stock was part of the divorce settlement and not a satisfaction of a pre-existing obligation. The court reasoned that the petitioner failed to prove her former husband had a separate legal liability to her that would justify a bad debt deduction and that any losses occurred before the tax year in question.

Facts

The petitioner and her former husband divorced in 1934, with a property settlement agreement characterizing payments as "alimony in gross." The agreement stipulated the husband would deliver a certain amount of stock to the petitioner. Prior to the divorce, the petitioner had given her husband stock for safekeeping, authorizing him to manage her investments. The husband placed her investments, including 1,044 shares of Sears, Roebuck & Co. stock, into an account bearing her name. At the time of the divorce, the account had a debit balance, with 762 shares held as collateral. In 1941, the petitioner compromised the settlement, receiving 98 fewer shares of stock than originally agreed.

Procedural History

The petitioner claimed a deduction on her 1941 tax return for the value of the 98 shares of stock she did not receive. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction. The petitioner then petitioned the Tax Court for review.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the compromise of the property settlement resulted in a deductible loss under Section 23(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the compromise of the property settlement resulted in a bad debt deduction under Section 23(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioner failed to demonstrate that her former husband was under any legal obligation to her outside of the marital settlement, which would form the basis for a deductible loss.
2. No, because the petitioner failed to prove that her former husband had any

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

legal liability that would provide the basis for a bad debt deduction.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that compromising an obligation to pay alimony is not a deductible loss because alimony is not a “transaction entered into for profit.” Unpaid alimony is also not deductible as a bad debt. The court relied on the principle that tax law is concerned with realized gains and losses, and the petitioner was not “out of pocket anything as the result of the promissor’s failure to comply with his agreement.” The court found no evidence supporting the petitioner’s claim that the stock agreement was separate from the alimony agreement and served to repay prior losses. It noted the petitioner’s awareness of her stock account’s management and lack of objection until shortly before the divorce. The court concluded that the petitioner had not demonstrated any legal liability on the part of her former husband that would justify a bad debt deduction, citing *Philip H. Schaff, 46 B. T. A. 640, 646*. Furthermore, any losses on the stock account occurred prior to the taxable year.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that simply labeling a divorce settlement as something other than alimony does not automatically make it deductible. Taxpayers must demonstrate a pre-existing legal obligation, independent of the marital relationship, to support a deduction for a compromised property settlement. Attorneys structuring divorce settlements must carefully document any underlying debts or obligations separate from alimony to increase the likelihood of deductibility. This case highlights the importance of establishing and proving the existence of a valid debt or obligation outside the context of the divorce proceedings. Later cases would likely distinguish this ruling if clear evidence of a separate business transaction or loan were present.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.