12 T.C. 681 (1949)

A settlor is not taxable on trust income under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code if the retained powers are construed as fiduciary powers and the settlor does not retain substantial ownership of the trust corpus.

Summary

Harvey C. Fruehauf created trusts for his wife and children, naming himself as trustee. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued the trust income should be included in Fruehauf's gross income under Section 22(a), 166, or 167 of the Internal Revenue Code, asserting Fruehauf retained significant control. The Tax Court held that the trust income was not taxable to Fruehauf because his powers were fiduciary, the trust was irrevocable, the beneficiaries were fixed, and the possibility of reverter was remote. Fruehauf's power to vote the stock held in trust was deemed fiduciary and for the beneficiaries' best interests.

Facts

Harvey C. Fruehauf, president of Fruehauf Trailer Co., established three irrevocable trusts on December 30, 1935, for the benefit of his wife, Angela, and their children. The trust agreement designated Fruehauf as the initial trustee. The trusts were funded with common stock of the Fruehauf Trailer Co. Income from the trusts was to be paid to Angela during her lifetime, and then to the children. Fruehauf retained the right to change the trustee but no other explicit powers. The trust instrument granted the trustee broad powers, including the power to invest in non-income producing securities.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Fruehauf's income tax for 1941, arguing the trust income was taxable to him. Fruehauf petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court ruled in favor of Fruehauf, holding that the trust income was not taxable to him. Judge Opper concurred only in the result. Judge Murdock dissented, arguing that the stated facts were insufficient to show error in the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the income from the trusts created by Fruehauf is taxable to him as the settlor under Section 22(a), 166, or 167 of the Internal Revenue Code, based on the powers and control he retained over the trusts.

Holding

No, because the powers retained by Fruehauf were fiduciary in nature, the trust was irrevocable, the beneficiaries were fixed, and the possibility of reverter was too

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

remote to justify taxing the income to the settlor.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that Fruehauf's powers as trustee were fiduciary and had to be exercised in good faith for the benefit of the trust beneficiaries. The court emphasized that the trust instrument was irrevocable, the income beneficiaries and ultimate distributees were fixed, and the possibility of a reverter was remote. The court distinguished the case from *Helvering v. Clifford*, noting that Fruehauf did not retain sufficient control to be considered the owner of the corpus. The court also addressed the Commissioner's arguments based on Sections 166 and 167, finding that the power to invade the corpus for the benefit of Fruehauf's wife and children was limited and did not allow Fruehauf to discharge his support obligations. The court cited *Cushman v. Commissioner*, stating, "The power to vote the stock held in trust may not be exercised by the trustee for his own purposes; and where such conduct is threatened a court of equity will direct the voting of the stock." Judge Murdock dissented, stating that the facts presented were insufficient to demonstrate error in the Commissioner's determination.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the circumstances under which a settlor can create a valid trust without being taxed on the trust's income. It highlights the importance of the settlor's retained powers being construed as fiduciary in nature, rather than for personal benefit. The decision emphasizes that retaining the power to vote stock held in trust does not automatically result in the trust income being taxed to the settlor, especially if that power must be exercised in the best interests of the beneficiaries. The decision provides a framework for analyzing whether a settlor has retained sufficient dominion and control over a trust to warrant taxing the income to them under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. Later cases cite this decision when evaluating the extent of control retained by the settlor of a trust and its impact on tax liability.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.