8 T.C. 1139 (1947)

A grantor is not taxed on trust income under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code when they establish irrevocable trusts, even with themselves as trustee, if they do not retain substantial dominion and control over the trust assets for their own benefit.

Summary

Welch established four irrevocable trusts for his wife and daughters, funding them with stock from his company, with himself as trustee. His wife also created two similar trusts, funded by stock gifted from Welch, also with Welch as trustee. The IRS argued Welch should be taxed on the income from all trusts. The Tax Court held that Welch was not taxable on the trust income under Section 22(a) because he did not retain enough control over the trust assets to justify treating the income as his own, and his wife's gifts were valid and not conditioned on creating the trusts.

Facts

Lewis W. Welch owned all 200 shares of Novi Equipment Co. stock. On June 28, 1941, he created four irrevocable trusts: one for each of his two daughters, and two for his wife with the daughters as remainder beneficiaries. He funded each trust with 15 shares of Novi stock and named himself trustee. On the same day, Welch gifted 30 shares of Novi stock to his wife, Marian. Marian then created two irrevocable trusts, one for each daughter, funding them with 15 shares each of the Novi stock she had just received from Welch and naming Welch as trustee. The trust instruments gave Welch, as trustee, broad administrative powers but prohibited him from revesting income to himself or altering beneficiaries' shares. Welch retained 110 shares of Novi stock in his own name.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against Welch, arguing that the income from all six trusts was taxable to him. Welch contested the deficiency in the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Welch should be considered the grantor of the trusts created by his wife and therefore taxable on their income.
2. Whether the income from the four trusts created by Welch is taxable to him under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, Welch is not considered the grantor of the trusts created by his wife because the gift of stock to his wife was unconditional, giving her the right to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

do with the stock as she pleased.
2. No, the income from the four trusts created by Welch is not taxable to him under Section 22(a) because he did not retain sufficient dominion and control over the trust assets.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the gift of stock to Welch's wife was unconditional, and there was no evidence that it was conditioned on her creating the trusts. The court emphasized that "To constitute a valid gift inter vivos the donor must have a clear and unequivocal intention to part with his property presently and forever." As to the trusts created by Welch, the court found that Welch did not retain sufficient dominion and control over the trust assets to justify taxing the income to him. The court distinguished the case from *Helvering v. Clifford*, noting that Welch had no power to direct income to beneficiaries other than those named in the trusts, and the beneficiaries had vested rights to the income. Welch's control of Novi Equipment Co. through his personally owned shares was also a factor. The court noted, "Thus he had complete control of the corporation by virtue of the shares of stock which he personally owned and without in any way relying upon the 90 shares of stock owned by the trusts." Ultimately, the court concluded that Welch could not spend the income for his own uses or change the beneficiaries, thus differentiating the case from situations where the grantor maintained significant control.

Practical Implications

Welch v. Commissioner clarifies the boundaries of grantor trust rules, emphasizing that merely acting as a trustee, even with broad administrative powers, does not automatically trigger taxation of trust income to the grantor. The case highlights the importance of an unconditional gift in separating the grantor from control over gifted assets. It informs legal practice by demonstrating that the grantor must retain substantial dominion and control over the trust assets for their own benefit to be taxed on the trust's income under Section 22(a). Later cases have cited *Welch* to distinguish situations where grantors retained excessive control, such as the power to change beneficiaries or use trust assets for personal obligations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. | 2