8 T.C. 637 (1947)

A taxpayer's transfer of literary property to a spouse or a foreign corporation solely for tax avoidance, without a genuine donative or business purpose, will be disregarded, and the income will be taxed to the transferor.

Summary

Pelham G. Wodehouse, a British author, contested deficiencies in his U.S. income tax liabilities for several years. The Tax Court addressed issues including the statute of limitations for 1923 and 1924, the validity of a fraud penalty for 1937, the taxability of literary income assigned to his wife and a Swiss corporation (Siva), and the allocation of income between U.S. and foreign sources. The court found the statute of limitations barred assessment for some years, rejected the fraud penalty, but upheld deficiencies for others due to improper income assignments and allocation.

Facts

Wodehouse, a nonresident alien, earned income from U.S. publications of his literary works. He filed U.S. tax returns through literary agents. In 1934, he assigned rights to his works to Siva, a Swiss corporation. In 1938 and later, he assigned portions of his literary properties to his wife. The IRS assessed deficiencies, arguing that Wodehouse improperly excluded income by these assignments and failed to properly allocate income sources.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in Wodehouse's income tax for 1923, 1924, 1937, 1938, 1940, and 1941. Wodehouse petitioned the Tax Court to contest these deficiencies. The Tax Court consolidated the cases, addressing various issues related to each tax year.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the statute of limitations barred assessment and collection for 1923 and 1924.
2. Whether the fraud penalty for 1937 was properly imposed.
3. Whether income assigned to Wodehouse's wife and Siva was properly excluded from his gross income.
4. Whether lump-sum payments for serial rights to literary productions were taxable as royalties.
5. Whether income was properly allocated between U.S. and foreign sources.
6. Whether attorney's fees were deductible.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because Wodehouse (or someone on his behalf) filed timely returns for 1923 and 1924.
2. No, because the IRS failed to prove fraud.
3. No, for the assignments to his wife in 1938, 1940, and 1941 because the assignments lacked a real donative intent and were primarily for tax avoidance; Yes, for income assigned to Siva for 1937 because IRS failed to prove fraud and the validity of the contract was not attacked.
4. Yes, because such payments are considered royalties taxable to the recipient, following *Sax Rohmer*.
5. No, because Wodehouse failed to provide a reliable basis for allocating specific values to Canadian rights.
6. Yes, because the fees were directly related to the production and collection of income and tax return preparation.

Court's Reasoning

Regarding the statute of limitations for 1923 and 1924, the court inferred that returns were filed, noting the IRS's refusal to produce subpoenaed records and the credit for amounts paid by Wodehouse's agents. For 1937, the court found the IRS failed to prove fraud in Wodehouse's dealings with Siva. Regarding the assignments to his wife, the court determined they lacked a "real donative intent" and were primarily tax avoidance schemes, resembling attempts to create a community property situation impermissible for a non-resident alien. The court quoted the attorney as saying the equivalent of community property status "'probably' could be accomplished by the petitioner's making a present to his wife of a half interest in his writings — prior to the realization of income therefrom." The court followed *Sax Rohmer*, holding lump-sum payments for serial rights are taxable as royalties. The court rejected allocating income to foreign sources absent a clear segregation of value between U.S. and foreign rights, referencing *Estate of Alexander Marton*. Finally, the court allowed the deduction for attorney's fees per IRC Section 23(a)(2).

Practical Implications

This case illustrates that assignments of income-producing property, especially to family members or controlled foreign entities, will be closely scrutinized for their underlying purpose. A primary tax avoidance motive, absent a genuine business or donative purpose, will cause the assignment to be disregarded and the income taxed to the assignor. Taxpayers must demonstrate a clear intent to relinquish control and benefit from the transferred property. The case reinforces the principle that taxpayers cannot use artificial arrangements to circumvent tax laws. It also highlights the importance of proper documentation when allocating income between U.S. and foreign sources and provides guidance on deducting attorney's fees related to income production and tax preparation. Later cases may cite this case to disallow deductions related to schemes that are clearly for tax avoidance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.