Frank Trust of 1931 v. Commissioner, 1942, 1 T.C. 985

A trust cannot deduct distributions to beneficiaries under Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code when the trust instrument mandates accumulation of income for minor beneficiaries, and attempted distributions are not for their maintenance, support, or education.

Summary

The Frank Trust sought to deduct $30,000 as distributions to its beneficiaries, settlor's minor children. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction, arguing that the amounts were not "properly paid or credited" to any beneficiary because under the trust terms, undistributed income for minors should be accumulated. The Tax Court agreed with the Commissioner, finding that the trust instrument directed accumulation of income not needed for the minors' maintenance, support, and education, and the attempted distributions were unlawful, thus not deductible by the trust.

Facts

The Frank Trust was established for the benefit of the settlor's children, both those living at the time of the trust's creation and any after-born children. All of the settlor's children were minors during the taxable year in question.

The trust agreement directed the trustees to pay income to the children in equal shares but subjected this direction to other provisions, particularly Article V, which applied specifically to periods when the children were minors.

Article V authorized the trustees to reinvest income not needed for the children's maintenance, support, and education during their minority. This reinvested income was to be paid to the children upon reaching 21 years of age.

The trust attempted to deduct distributions of $10,000 to each child, but these amounts were not actually spent on the children's maintenance, support, or education. Instead, the trustees retained and invested these sums in loans to another trust.

Procedural History

The Commissioner disallowed the trust's deduction for distributions to beneficiaries. The Frank Trust petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the Frank Trust was entitled to deduct distributions to its beneficiaries under Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code, given that the beneficiaries were minors and the trust instrument contained provisions for accumulating income not needed for their maintenance, support, and education.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

No, because the trust instrument mandated accumulation of income for minor beneficiaries not needed for their maintenance, support, or education, any attempted distribution for other purposes was unlawful and could not be properly credited, thus, not deductible by the trust.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that to be deductible under Section 162, the trust agreement must either require current distribution of income or authorize discretionary distribution or accumulation. For minor beneficiaries, Article V of the trust agreement controlled, authorizing the trustees to accumulate income not needed for their maintenance, support, and education.

The court found that the term "accumulate" need not be explicitly stated; it can be implied from the language used. The court stated that it was the settlor's intent that the income retained pursuant to Article V shall be distributed as corpus when the child shall attain the age of 21. The minor beneficiaries have no control over the income retained unless and until he or she reaches the age of 21 years.

The trust's attempted distributions were not for the specified purposes of maintenance, support, or education, and therefore, were unlawful under the terms of the trust. As the court stated, "If then, it was the duty of the trustees to accumulate the income not needed for maintenance, support, and education of the minor beneficiaries, any attempted distribution for other purposes was unlawful and no proper credit could and did occur."

The letter from the infant beneficiaries directing reinvestment of income merely confirmed the trustees' determination that the income was not needed for their immediate needs and aligned with the trust's accumulation mandate.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the importance of carefully drafting trust instruments to clearly define the trustees' powers and duties regarding income distribution, especially when dealing with minor beneficiaries.

It clarifies that a trust instrument can effectively mandate the accumulation of income for minors, even without explicitly using the word "accumulate," if the intent is clear from the overall context of the agreement.

It highlights that attempted distributions contrary to the terms of the trust, such as those not aligned with the stated purpose of maintenance, support, or education, are not deductible for tax purposes.

Attorneys must advise settlors that the specific language in the trust document will govern whether distributions are considered "properly paid or credited" for deduction purposes.

This case influences how tax attorneys advise clients setting up trusts for minor children, particularly regarding discretionary vs. mandatory distribution clauses. It is crucial to ensure that the trustees' actions align with the stated purpose and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

intent within the trust document.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.