15 T.C. 136 (1950)

When a trust violates the rule against perpetuities under state law, resulting in the acceleration of gifts to beneficiaries, the trust assets are generally not included in the grantor's gross estate for federal estate tax purposes, and transfers to the trust are not considered to be made in contemplation of death if the grantor had life-associated motives.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether the assets of a trust created by Cyrus M. Beachy should be included in his gross estate for estate tax purposes. The trust provided income to Beachy's grandchildren, with the corpus to be distributed when the youngest grandchild reached 40. The Kansas Supreme Court ruled the trust violated the rule against perpetuities, accelerating the gift to the grandchildren. The Tax Court held that because the trust was invalid under state law and the gifts accelerated, the trust assets were not includible in Beachy's estate under sections 811(a), 811(c), or 811(d) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court further found the transfers were not made in contemplation of death.

Facts

Cyrus M. Beachy created the Cyrus M. Beachy Trust No. 1 on November 11, 1939, naming himself as trustee. He transferred various assets to the trust, reporting these as gifts and paying the associated gift tax. The trust agreement stipulated that net income would be paid to his grandchildren, Owen Coe McEwen and Ellen McEwen, with provisions for using the corpus for their comfort and support. The trust was to terminate when the youngest grandchild reached 40, at which point the property would pass to them absolutely. Beachy died on February 18, 1945. His will, executed earlier, divided his estate primarily between his daughter and a trust for his grandchildren. Beachy's daughter predeceased him. At the time of the trust's creation, Beachy was 76 years old and actively managing a large company.

Procedural History

The IRS determined a deficiency in Beachy's estate tax, including the trust assets in his gross estate. John D. McEwen, as successor trustee, initiated a declaratory judgment action in Kansas state court to determine the validity of the trust. The District Court of Sedgwick County, Kansas, ruled the trust violated the rule against perpetuities, accelerating the gifts to the beneficiaries. The Kansas Supreme Court affirmed this decision. The case then proceeded to the Tax Court to determine the federal estate tax implications.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the value of the property in the Cyrus M. Beachy Trust No. 1 is includible in the decedent's gross estate under section 811(a) of the Internal

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Revenue Code, as property in which the decedent had an interest?

2. Whether the transfers to the trust were made in contemplation of death, or intended to take effect at or after death, under section 811(c) of the Internal Revenue Code?

3. Whether the transfers were revocable, amendable, or terminable, thus includible under section 811(d)(1) or (d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the Kansas Supreme Court determined the trust violated the rule against perpetuities, resulting in the accelerated and absolute transfer of the gifts to the grandchildren.

2. No, because the transfers were motivated by life-associated purposes, such as the comfort and support of the beneficiaries, and not by the anticipation of death.

3. No, because the trust was deemed invalid under state law, thus precluding the application of federal estate tax provisions related to revocable transfers.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court deferred to the Kansas Supreme Court's determination that the trust violated the rule against perpetuities, resulting in an accelerated gift to the beneficiaries. The court cited the Restatement of Property § 236, which supports the acceleration of succeeding interests when a prior trust interest fails due to unlawful duration. Because the gifts were accelerated and became absolute upon transfer, the decedent no longer held an interest in the property at the time of his death, making section 811(a) inapplicable. Regarding section 811(c), the court found the transfers were not made in contemplation of death. The court emphasized Beachy's active involvement in his business, his good health, and the fact that the trust represented only a small portion of his total property. The court concluded that the trust was created to provide for the comfort and support of his grandchildren, reflecting life-associated motives rather than a contemplation of death, citing *United States v. Wells*, 283 U.S. 102. Finally, the court reasoned that because the trust was invalid under state law, the provisions concerning revocable transfers were inapplicable.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of considering state property law in federal estate tax matters. If a trust is deemed invalid under state law, particularly due to violating the rule against perpetuities, the federal tax implications can be significantly altered. Specifically, assets transferred to such a trust may not be included in the grantor's gross estate if the gifts are accelerated to the beneficiaries. This decision underscores the need for careful drafting of trust instruments to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

comply with state law and to clearly articulate the grantor's intent. Attorneys should also consider the potential for declaratory judgment actions in state court to resolve uncertainties about the validity of trust provisions, as such determinations can have a direct impact on federal tax liabilities. This case serves as a reminder that seemingly straightforward tax questions can be heavily influenced by underlying property rights as defined by state law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.