8 T.C. 1313 (1947)

A payment made by a taxpayer on behalf of another party is considered a gift, not a debt, for tax deduction purposes when the surrounding circumstances indicate a donative intent, such as a prior pattern of generosity or a subsequent relinquishment of any right to repayment.

Summary

Charles Matthews guaranteed his secretary Gertrude Stackhouse's stock margin trading account. In 1941, he paid $31,372.44 under the guaranty. Later in 1941, he married Gertrude, after executing an antenuptial agreement relinquishing all claims against her property and establishing a trust fund for her benefit. The Tax Court held that Matthews was not entitled to a bad debt deduction for the payment because the circumstances indicated that it was a gift, not a loan creating a debtor-creditor relationship. His actions, including codicils to his will and the antenuptial agreement, demonstrated an intent to provide for her without expectation of repayment.

Facts

Charles Matthews, retired from business, employed Gertrude Stackhouse as his secretary. Stackhouse opened a brokerage account in 1927, which Matthews guaranteed in 1930. He also guaranteed a second account she opened in 1938. Before marrying Stackhouse in November 1941, Matthews made two codicils to his will directing his executors not to seek reimbursement from Stackhouse for any payments made under the guaranties. On July 30, 1941, Matthews paid $31,372.44 to settle Stackhouse's debt with Robert Glendinning & Co. He did not receive a note or evidence of indebtedness from her.

Procedural History

Matthews deducted $31,372.44 as a bad debt on his 1941 income tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction, resulting in a tax deficiency. Matthews petitioned the Tax Court, arguing that a debtor-creditor relationship arose when he paid Stackhouse's debt and that the debt became worthless in 1941.

Issue(s)

Whether the payment of $31,372.44 by Matthews to settle Stackhouse's brokerage account constituted a gift or created a debtor-creditor relationship entitling Matthews to a bad debt deduction in 1941.

Holding

No, because the totality of circumstances indicated that Matthews intended to make

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

a gift to Stackhouse, not to create a debt. Therefore, no debtor-creditor relationship arose.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that several factors demonstrated Matthews' donative intent. First, he had previously directed in codicils to his will that his executor should not seek reimbursement from Stackhouse. Second, shortly before the payment, he allowed her to withdraw securities from the account, increasing his liability. Third, he did not pursue her assets, even though she had some unpledged property. Fourth, the antenuptial agreement relinquished all rights he might have against her property, including any debt arising from the payment. The court distinguished this case from others where a debtor-creditor relationship was clearly established. Even assuming a debt existed, Matthews voluntarily relinquished his right to recover it and made no attempt to enforce collection, which further undermined his claim for a bad debt deduction. As the court stated, "where a taxpayer, because of the personal relations between himself and his debtor, is not willing to enforce payment of his debt, he is not entitled to deduct it as worthless."

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on distinguishing between a gift and a debt for tax purposes, particularly when dealing with payments made to family members or close associates. It emphasizes the importance of examining all surrounding circumstances to determine the taxpayer's intent. Taxpayers seeking a bad debt deduction must demonstrate a genuine expectation of repayment and reasonable efforts to collect the debt. Agreements that release or forgive debt, especially in the context of marriage or familial relationships, can be interpreted as evidence of donative intent, precluding a bad debt deduction. This ruling highlights the need for clear documentation and consistent behavior to support the existence of a debtor-creditor relationship in such situations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.