Gitter v. Commissioner, 13 T.C. 520 (1949)

For tax years 1943 and 1944, dependency status for tax exemption purposes requires that the taxpayer provide over half of the alleged dependent's support, and that the alleged dependent is either incapable of self-support due to mental or physical defect or is not a citizen or subject of a foreign country residing outside the United States.

Summary

The petitioner sought dependency exemptions for his son and daughter-in-law (1943 and 1944), his sister, and his sister and brother-in-law (1944). The Tax Court denied the exemptions. For 1943, the son and daughter-in-law were deemed capable of self-support. For 1944, while the petitioner provided over half the support for some, the son and daughter-in-law living in England and the sister and brother-in-law living in Italy were considered citizens or subjects of a foreign country residing outside the US. The court emphasized that tax exemptions are matters of legislative grace and require strict compliance with the statutory terms.

Facts

The petitioner, in 1943, provided $2,800 to his son and daughter-in-law, Samson and Minna Gitter, who resided in England. Neither Samson nor Minna had any income. In 1944, the petitioner provided approximately $2,400 to Samson and Minna. The petitioner also provided support to his sister, Hinda Schulz, and to his sister and brother-in-law, Cilla and Leone Schreier, who resided in Italy. The Gitters were Austrian citizens who fled to England. The Schreiers were living in Trieste and were considered Italian citizens.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the dependency exemptions claimed by the petitioner. The petitioner appealed the Commissioner's decision to the Tax Court of the United States.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Samson and Minna Gitter qualified as dependents in 1943 under Section 25(b)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether Samson and Minna Gitter, Hinda Schulz, and Cilla and Leone Schreier qualified as dependents in 1944 under Section 25(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because Samson and Minna Gitter were not incapable of self-support due to mental or physical defect in 1943.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because Samson and Minna Gitter and Cilla and Leone Schreier were citizens or subjects of a foreign country residing outside the United States in 1944. Petitioner also failed to prove he provided over half the support for Hinda Schulz.

Court's Reasoning

Regarding the 1943 claim, the court emphasized that Section 25(b)(2)(A) required the alleged dependent to be either under 18 or incapable of self-support due to mental or physical defect. Since both Samson and Minna were over 18 and capable of working, the exemption was denied. The court noted that involuntary unemployment, even due to wartime regulations, did not qualify as a physical or mental defect. As to the 1944 claim, Section 25(b)(3) required that the taxpayer provide over half the support and that the alleged dependent not be a citizen or subject of a foreign country residing outside the United States. While the petitioner provided over half the support to Samson and Minna Gitter and Cilla and Leone Schreier, the court found that they were citizens or subjects of a foreign country. The court determined that the Gitters remained Austrian citizens because they never elected to become German citizens after the annexation of Austria. The Schreiers were deemed Italian citizens, or at least subjects of Italy. The court relied on legislative history (H. Report No. 1365) indicating Congress intended to exclude any nonresident alien unless residing in a contiguous country to the US. The court stated: "We conclude that Congress meant to exclude all nonresident aliens, citizens or noncitizens, from the status of dependents unless they resided in North America, when it used the phrase 'citizen or subject of a foreign country' residing outside the United States or a country contiguous thereto."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the requirements for claiming dependency exemptions, particularly when supporting relatives residing outside the United States. It emphasizes the importance of proving both financial support and the dependent's legal status. The ruling highlights that even if an individual is not a citizen of a foreign country, they can still be considered a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.