Estate of Peck v. Commissioner, 15 T.C. 150 (1950)

For federal income tax purposes, not every arrangement labeled a “trust” qualifies as a trust, and the intent to create a genuine trust transaction, not merely a mechanism for managing funds, is crucial.

Summary

The Tax Court determined that annuity payments made to named individuals designated as “trustees” were taxable to the guardians of the incompetent beneficiaries, rather than to a trust. George H. Peck purchased annuity contracts to provide income for his incompetent children. While he designated family members as “trustees” to receive the payments, the court found that Peck’s intent was not to create a formal trust, but rather to ensure the continued care and support of his children. The court reasoned that Peck’s actions and the subsequent actions of the “trustees” were inconsistent with the creation of a valid trust for tax purposes.

Facts

George H. Peck purchased annuity contracts from Travelers Insurance Company to provide monthly income for his two incompetent children.
Endorsement D directed Travelers to pay the annuities to named individuals as “trustees”.
Peck had also established a substantial inter vivos trust and a testamentary trust for his children.
Peck’s correspondence with Travelers indicated his primary concern was to provide a permanent monthly income for his children, restricting their ability to assign or commute the payments.
After Peck’s death, the named “trustees” deposited the annuity checks into an account for the incompetents and later turned the funds over to the court-appointed guardians.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the annuity income was taxable to the guardians of the incompetents.
The guardians, as petitioners, argued that a valid trust was created, and the income should be taxed to the trust estate under Section 161 of the Internal Revenue Code.
The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner’s determination.

Issue(s)

Whether George H. Peck intended to and did create a valid trust for the annuity payments when he directed Travelers to pay the annuities to named individuals as “trustees”.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

No, because George H. Peck did not intend to create a formal, genuine trust, but rather intended for the named individuals to manage the funds for the care and support of his incompetent children, consistent with his own practices during his lifetime. Therefore, the income is taxable to the guardians, not to a trust.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that not every arrangement labeled a "trust" constitutes a trust for federal income tax purposes, citing *Stoddard v. Eaton*, 22 F.2d 184 (D. Conn. 1927), which held that the term "trust" in revenue statutes does not encompass every type of trust recognized in equity, such as a trust ex maleficio or a constructive trust. A revenue statute addresses itself to genuine trust transactions, not fictions.

The court emphasized Peck's intent, as evidenced by his communications with Travelers, which focused on ensuring a permanent income stream for his children and preventing them from accessing the funds in a lump sum.

The court also noted that Peck already established two express trusts for his children, suggesting he intended for the annuity payments to be managed differently.

The actions of the named "trustees" after Peck's death, depositing the annuity checks into the incompetents' account and turning the funds over to the guardians, demonstrated their understanding that they were simply managing the funds for the beneficiaries' benefit, not acting as formal trustees.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of intent when determining whether a trust exists for tax purposes. Simply labeling an arrangement a "trust" is insufficient; the arrangement must possess the characteristics of a genuine trust transaction.

Attorneys must carefully analyze the settlor's intent, the terms of the agreement, and the actions of the parties involved to determine whether a valid trust has been created for tax purposes.

Practitioners should advise clients to clearly document their intent when establishing trusts, especially when dealing with vulnerable beneficiaries.

This case serves as a reminder that substance, not form, governs the determination of a trust's existence for federal income tax purposes, influencing how similar arrangements are structured and taxed.

Later cases may distinguish *Estate of Peck* by demonstrating a clearer intent to create a formal trust, with specific provisions and trustee responsibilities outlined in a written instrument.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.