10 T.C. 724 (1948)

Alimony payments are considered periodic, and thus deductible for the payer, if the divorce decree does not specify a fixed total sum to be paid, even if the payments are for a fixed period, and the amount of the payments depend on future income.

Summary

Roland Young sought to deduct alimony payments made to his former wife from his 1942 and 1943 income taxes. The Tax Court addressed whether these payments qualified as deductible "periodic payments" or non-deductible "installment payments" under Section 22(k) and 23(u) of the Internal Revenue Code. The divorce decree mandated payments for a fixed 50-month period, but the amount of each payment varied based on Young's fluctuating annual income. The Tax Court held that because the divorce decree did not specify a definite total sum, the payments were "periodic payments" and thus deductible by Young.

Facts

Roland Young and Marjorie Kummer Young divorced in California in 1941. A written agreement from February 20, 1940, settled their property rights and support claims. The final divorce judgment incorporated this agreement, requiring Young to make monthly payments to Marjorie and a trustee for her benefit for 50 months. The amount of monthly payments depended on Young's net income for the preceding year; if his income was $50,000, he paid $1,000 per month. If his income fell below $50,000, the monthly payments were proportionately reduced. The obligation terminated upon the death of either party. Young was a free-lance actor with fluctuating income.

Procedural History

Young deducted alimony payments on his 1942 and 1943 federal income tax returns. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed these deductions, arguing they did not constitute proper deductions under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code. Young then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether the alimony payments made by Young to his former wife pursuant to the divorce decree constitute deductible "periodic payments" or non-deductible "installment payments" under Sections 22(k) and 23(u) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

Yes, because the divorce decree did not specify a definite total sum to be paid, even though payments were required for a fixed period. The amounts depended on

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Young's fluctuating future income, making them "periodic payments" rather than "installment payments."

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court focused on whether the payments were "periodic payments" or "installment payments discharging a part of an obligation the principal sum of which is, in terms of money or property, specified in the decree." The court emphasized that Section 22(k) includes periodic payments in the wife's gross income and allows the husband to deduct them. The Court determined that the payments were alimony payments, intended for the support and maintenance of Marjorie Young. The court found that the decree only prescribed a maximum total monthly payment based on a $50,000 annual net income and a method for computing payments if the income was below that threshold. Crucially, it did not establish a fixed total sum to be paid over the 50-month period. The court stated, "These provisions did no more than prescribe a maximum total monthly payment, based upon an annual net income of $50,000, and a method for computing monthly payments on the basis of any annual net income below $50,000. These provisions did not fix any total sum as a fixed sum to be paid over the fixed period of fifty months."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the distinction between periodic and installment payments in divorce decrees for tax purposes. It establishes that if the total amount to be paid as alimony is not fixed and depends on future earnings, the payments are likely to be considered periodic, even if they are to be made over a defined time. Attorneys drafting divorce agreements should be aware that tying alimony payments to a fluctuating income source can ensure deductibility for the payor. This decision impacts how similar cases are analyzed, emphasizing the importance of a definite sum specified in the decree. The court distinguished this case from *J.B. Steinel*, where the husband had a specified principal sum to pay, reinforcing that the presence of a fixed obligation is key to classifying payments as installment payments.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.