14 T.C. 127 (1950)

Trust income that is required to be distributed to a beneficiary is taxable to that beneficiary, regardless of whether it is actually distributed, but the beneficiary is only entitled to deductions for expenses properly chargeable against income, not those chargeable against the trust corpus.

Summary

Edith Bryant was the secondary income beneficiary and remainderman of a testamentary trust. The trustee received income during 1943 and 1944 that was distributable to Bryant. After the primary beneficiary's death in 1943, the trustee continued to administer the trust, eventually distributing the assets to Bryant in 1944 after a non-judicial accounting. The IRS argued that the trust effectively terminated earlier, making more of the income taxable to Bryant. The Tax Court held that the trust continued until the final distribution, and only income required to be distributed was taxable to Bryant, with deductions limited to expenses chargeable against income.

Facts

S.E. Moorhead created a testamentary trust, with Guaranty Trust Co. as trustee. The trust directed the trustee to pay $10,000 annually to his wife, Anna Moorhead, and the remaining income to his daughter, Edith Bryant (petitioner). Upon Anna's death, the trust would terminate, and the principal would be distributed to Edith. Anna Moorhead died on October 17, 1943. The trustee received income in 1943, both before and after Anna's death, and in 1944 before final distribution to Edith on April 3, 1944. Edith and the trustee executed a non-judicial accounting agreement as of February 21, 1944.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Bryant's income and victory tax for 1943 and in income tax for 1944, including certain dividends received by the trust in Bryant's income. Bryant petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of these deficiencies.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the testamentary trust continued for a reasonable period after the death of the primary beneficiary, such that the trustee's actions were governed by the trust terms until final distribution.
2. To what extent the income received by the trust in 1943 and 1944 was currently distributable to the petitioner and therefore taxable to her.
3. Whether the petitioner is entitled to deduct expenses charged to the trust corpus in determining her taxable income from the trust.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the trust did not terminate automatically upon the death of the primary beneficiary, but continued for a reasonable period to allow for the proper winding up of its affairs and distribution of the corpus.
2. The amounts of net income currently distributable and taxable to the petitioner are determined according to the terms of the trust instrument for the respective taxable periods involved, considering the amounts due to the primary beneficiary's estate.
3. No, because only expenses properly chargeable against income are deductible from income when determining the beneficiary's taxable income; expenses charged against the corpus are deductible from the corpus, not from the beneficiary's income.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the trust did not terminate automatically upon Anna Moorhead's death but continued for a period reasonably necessary to wind up its affairs. The court cited New York law, which holds that title to personalty in a trust estate remains with the trustees until paid out or distributed under the trust agreement. The court found the period from October 17, 1943, to April 3, 1944, reasonable for finalizing the trust. The court emphasized that under IRC § 162(b), income required to be distributed currently is taxable to the beneficiary, irrespective of actual distribution. The court determined that only expenses properly chargeable against income could be deducted from the income distributable to Bryant. Expenses chargeable against the trust corpus were not deductible from her income. As the court stated, "The test of whether the income in controversy is taxable to petitioner depends upon its then deductibility by the trust." It cited *Freuler v. Helvering*, 291 U.S. 35, to reinforce that taxability depends on the right to receive, not on what was actually done.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the tax implications for beneficiaries of trusts during the period of trust administration following the death of a primary beneficiary. It confirms that the trust continues for a reasonable wind-up period. More importantly, it emphasizes that beneficiaries are taxed on income that is *required* to be distributed, regardless of actual distribution. It establishes that beneficiaries can only deduct expenses properly chargeable against income when determining their taxable income, aligning tax liability with the character of trust expenses under state law. This affects trust administration, requiring trustees to carefully allocate expenses between income and corpus. Later cases cite *Bryant* for the principle that the taxability of trust income to a beneficiary hinges on its deductibility by the trust and the proper allocation of expenses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.