7 T.C. 413 (1946)

When a divorce agreement provides a single payment for both spousal and child support, the portion specifically earmarked for child support is not deductible by the payor spouse.

Summary

This case concerns whether a taxpayer can deduct the full amount of payments made to his former wife under a separation agreement. The agreement, incorporated into a divorce decree, provided for a single payment covering both the wife's personal support and the support of their children. The Tax Court held that only the portion of the payment allocated to the wife's support was deductible, while the portion earmarked for child support was not. The court emphasized that the agreement must be construed as a whole to determine the true nature of the payments.

Facts

Robert W. Budd entered into a separation agreement with his wife in contemplation of divorce. The agreement was subsequently ratified and adopted by the divorce court. The agreement stipulated a single payment covering both the wife's personal support and the support and maintenance of their children. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued that a portion of the payment was specifically for child support and, therefore, not deductible by Budd.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against Budd, disallowing a portion of the deduction claimed for alimony payments. Budd petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, finding that a portion of the payment was earmarked for child support and not deductible. The Court of Appeals affirmed the Tax Court's decision.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a single payment made pursuant to a divorce agreement, which covers both spousal and child support, is fully deductible by the payor spouse under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. If not fully deductible, whether the portion of the payment attributable to child support can be determined from the agreement.

Holding

1. No, because Section 22(k) only allows the deduction of payments made for the support of the spouse, not for the support of children.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Yes, because the court can examine the agreement as a whole to determine if a specific portion of the payment is “earmarked” for child support.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that determining the deductibility of payments requires a careful construction of the separation agreement as a whole, reading each paragraph in light of all others. The court found that $2,400 of the payment was “earmarked” for the support of the children. The court relied on Sections 22(k) and 23(u) of the Internal Revenue Code, which allow a deduction for alimony payments but not for child support. The court cited previous cases such as *Dora H. Moitoret*, 7 T.C. 640, where the amount for child support was not identifiable, leading to a different result. In this case, however, the agreement allowed for the portion for the children to be determined. As the court stated, “an adequate consideration of the problem here presented requires a construction of the agreement as a whole, and the reading of each paragraph in the light of all the other paragraphs thereof.”

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes the importance of clearly delineating spousal support from child support in divorce agreements to ensure proper tax treatment. Attorneys drafting these agreements should be explicit about the intended use of the funds. If an agreement lumps payments together, it increases the likelihood that the IRS will challenge the deductibility of the entire payment. The case provides a rule that family law practitioners must understand and apply when negotiating and drafting separation agreements. Later cases have used Budd as a basis to determine whether specific language creates a fixed amount for child support. It further illustrates that the substance of the agreement, rather than its form, will govern the tax consequences.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.