Robert W. Budd, 7 T.C. 413

When a divorce decree or separation agreement designates a specific portion of a payment for child support, that portion is not considered alimony and is not deductible by the payor or taxable to the recipient.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether payments made by the petitioner to his former wife under a separation agreement, later incorporated into a divorce decree, were fully deductible as alimony or partially designated as non-deductible child support. The court analyzed the separation agreement to determine if a specific portion of the payment was earmarked for the support of the children. The court held that $2,400 of the total payment was specifically designated for child support and thus not deductible by the petitioner.

Facts

Robert W. Budd (petitioner) entered into a separation agreement with his former wife in contemplation of divorce. The agreement was later ratified and adopted by the state court as part of the divorce decree. The agreement provided for payments to the wife for her personal support and maintenance, as well as for the support and maintenance of their children. The payments were calculated based on a sliding scale, but the minimum payment amount triggered a specific clause in the agreement.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that a portion of the payments made by the petitioner was for child support and therefore not deductible. The petitioner challenged this determination in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the $3,600 paid by the petitioner to his former wife, pursuant to a separation agreement, is deductible in full as alimony, or only in part, under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code, considering the agreement provides for both the wife’s support and the children’s support.

Holding

No, only a portion is deductible. The Court held that $2,400 was “earmarked” for the support of the children and is therefore not deductible because Sections 22(k) and 23(u) of the I.R.C. treat alimony and child support differently.

Court’s Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court emphasized that the determination hinges on interpreting the agreement as a whole. The court reviewed prior cases, such as *Dora H. Moitoret, 7 T.C. 640*, noting that each case depends on its specific facts and the terms of the decree or written instrument. The court focused on the clause triggered by the minimum payment amount, concluding that a specific portion of the payment was designated for child support. It stated, "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." Further, the court explicitly stated that "$2,400 out of the payment to the wife was 'earmarked' for the support of the children." The court cited its decision was affirmed in *Budd v. Commissioner*, reinforcing the idea that similar facts lead to the same conclusion.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of clearly defining the nature of payments in separation agreements and divorce decrees. If the intent is to maximize the alimony deduction, the agreement should avoid earmarking specific amounts for child support. Attorneys drafting these agreements must carefully consider the language used to ensure it accurately reflects the parties' intentions and complies with relevant tax laws. Failing to do so can result in unexpected tax consequences for both the payor and the recipient. This case also establishes that courts will look at the agreement as a whole to determine the true nature of the payments, even if the agreement does not explicitly state the allocation. Later cases have applied this principle to scrutinize agreements for hidden child support provisions. For example, agreements that reduce payments upon a child reaching the age of majority are often viewed as allocating a portion to child support.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.