Florence E. Buckley v. Commissioner, 22 T.C. 1312 (1954)

When a taxpayer surrenders life insurance policies and receives annuity contracts in return, payments received under the annuity contracts are taxed as annuities, not as life insurance proceeds, regardless of whether the annuity terms were dictated by the original life insurance policies.

Summary

Florence E. Buckley surrendered life insurance policies on her husband's life and elected to receive the cash surrender value in the form of annuity payments. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue sought to tax a portion of the annuity payments. The Tax Court had to determine whether the payments should be taxed as life insurance proceeds (potentially exempt) or as annuity payments (partially taxable). The court held that the payments were taxable as annuity payments because they were received under new annuity contracts, even though the terms were based on the original life insurance policies. The court emphasized that the payments would not have been made under the original life insurance contracts while they were in force and the husband was alive.

Facts

Petitioner, Florence E. Buckley, held life insurance policies on her husband's life. Prior to her husband's death, she surrendered these policies. Upon surrender, she elected settlement options that provided for annual payments to her for life, based on the cash surrender value of the policies. The terms of the new annuity contracts were often dictated by provisions in the original life insurance policies. The petitioner then received payments from insurance companies after she chose to have the surrender value paid to her in annual payments for her life.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the petitioner's income tax. The petitioner challenged this determination in the Tax Court. The Tax Court reviewed the case to determine the proper tax treatment of the payments received.

Issue(s)

Whether payments received under annuity contracts, obtained after surrendering life insurance policies and electing settlement options, are taxable as life insurance proceeds or as annuity payments under Section 22(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

Yes, because the payments were received under new annuity contracts, not the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

original life insurance policies, and because the payments would not have been made under the life insurance contracts while the insured was alive.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 22(b) of the Internal Revenue Code distinguishes between life insurance contracts and annuity contracts. While amounts received under a life insurance contract paid by reason of death are generally excluded from gross income, amounts received as an annuity under an annuity or endowment contract are included, subject to a 3% rule. The court acknowledged that the original policies were undoubtedly life insurance policies. However, the payments in question were made under new agreements that could only be characterized as annuities. Even though the terms of the new contracts were often dictated by the original life insurance policies, the critical point was that the amounts were paid under the new agreements. As the court noted, “[T]he amounts in question were paid under the new agreements and would not have been paid under the life insurance contracts while the latter were in force and petitioner’s husband was alive.” The court referenced Anna L. Raymond, 40 B. T. A. 244, affd. (C. C. A., 7th Cir.), 114 Fed. (2d) 140; certiorari denied, 311 U. S. 710, to further support its holding. Since the Commissioner only sought to include the 3% specified in the annuity provision, the same result would obtain whether the payments were considered annuities paid under a life insurance contract or under an annuity contract.

Practical Implications

This case provides clarity on the tax treatment of annuity payments received after the surrender of life insurance policies. It establishes that the form of the agreement under which the payments are made, rather than the origin of the funds, determines the tax treatment. This decision informs how similar transactions should be structured and analyzed for tax purposes, emphasizing the importance of understanding the specific terms and conditions of the agreements. Later cases applying this ruling would likely focus on whether the payments truly arise from a new annuity contract or are merely a disguised distribution of life insurance proceeds. The case also highlights that taxpayers should carefully consider the tax implications when electing settlement options upon surrendering life insurance policies. The Tax Court’s analysis confirms the government’s power to tax income broadly unless a specific exclusion applies; Section 22(b) is an exclusion and narrowly construed.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.