10 T.C. 388 (1948)

Transfers to a trust for the benefit of a minor child, even when required by a separation agreement and divorce decree, can be considered a taxable gift to the extent the value of the transfer exceeds the legal obligation of support during the child's minority.

Summary

Roland M. Hooker challenged a gift tax deficiency assessed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue following transfers he made to trusts for his children, as mandated by a separation agreement and subsequent divorce decree. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, finding that the transfers, to the extent they exceeded Hooker's legal obligation to support his minor children, constituted taxable gifts. The court reasoned that while transfers to a spouse under a divorce agreement may be considered bargained-for exchanges, transfers for the benefit of children require a demonstration of adequate consideration or the absence of donative intent to avoid gift tax consequences. The court rejected Hooker's argument that a court-ordered transfer automatically negates donative intent.

Facts

Roland Hooker and his wife, Winifred, separated in 1935 and entered into a separation agreement. Pursuant to this agreement, Hooker established two trusts, one for each of their children, Edward and Margaret. He initially funded each trust with property worth $97,980. The separation agreement stipulated further contributions to the trusts based on future inheritances Hooker might receive from his mother. A Nevada divorce decree incorporated the separation agreement. After Hooker's mother died in 1939, he failed to add the required portions of his inheritance to the trusts. Edward, through Winifred, sued Hooker for specific performance, and the Connecticut court ordered Hooker to transfer additional property worth $159,366.75 to Edward's trust in 1943.

Procedural History

The Commissioner assessed a gift tax deficiency based on the 1943 transfer, determining that the portion exceeding Hooker's child support obligation was a taxable gift. Hooker contested the deficiency in the Tax Court. The Commissioner also attempted to increase the deficiency based on an earlier transfer to Hooker's wife but ultimately failed to prove it was a gift. The Tax Court upheld the deficiency assessment, leading to this opinion.

Issue(s)

1. Whether transfers made to a trust for the benefit of a minor child, pursuant to a separation agreement and a court order for specific performance, constitute taxable gifts under Section 1002 of the Internal Revenue Code to the extent

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

that the value of the transferred property exceeds the legal obligation for child support?

Holding

1. Yes, because the transfer of property to the trust exceeded the adequate and full consideration for the support of the minor child, and absent further proof showing that Hooker did not intend to make a gift and that there was adequate consideration in money or money's worth, the transfer to the trust is considered a taxable gift.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 1002 of the Internal Revenue Code, which states that transfers for less than adequate consideration are deemed gifts. The court reasoned that Hooker's transfers to the trusts, beyond the amount necessary for his children's support during their minority, lacked adequate consideration. The court distinguished this case from cases involving transfers to a spouse in divorce settlements, where an arm's-length transaction and absence of donative intent are often presumed. The court emphasized that transfers for the benefit of minor children do not automatically negate donative intent. The court found that Hooker's initial intent to augment the trusts showed donative intent. The court stated, "Courts, asked to enforce contracts, do not inquire into the adequacy of consideration in cases, such as this, involving no fraud of any kind, but enforce agreements supported by any valid consideration. Congress legislates in the light of existing law. It may not be supposed that it intended to pass a law which could be circumvented by the clever process of entering into an agreement to make a transfer, supported by an inadequate money consideration, and then making the transfer to satisfy a judgment on the agreement." It concluded that the transfers, mandated by a court order, did not transform the excess value into a non-gift transfer.

Practical Implications

Hooker v. Commissioner clarifies that even court-ordered transfers to trusts for children incident to divorce are subject to gift tax scrutiny. Practitioners must carefully assess the extent of the parental support obligation when structuring settlements. The case highlights the importance of demonstrating adequate consideration in money or money's worth or disproving donative intent, particularly in situations involving transfers for the benefit of minor children within the context of divorce or separation. Subsequent cases have cited *Hooker* to reinforce the principle that the mere existence of a legal obligation or court order does not automatically preclude a finding of a taxable gift if the transferred value significantly exceeds the obligation and donative intent is present.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.