15 T.C. 947 (1950)

A taxpayer cannot deduct life insurance premiums paid on a policy covering their own life if they are directly or indirectly a beneficiary of that policy, even if another party is the named beneficiary, especially in the context of a partnership agreement.

Summary

Keefe and his business partner Bausman had a partnership agreement where each took out life insurance on his own life, naming the other as beneficiary. The agreement stipulated that upon the death of either partner, the insurance proceeds would be paid to the deceased partner's representative to satisfy their interest in the partnership. Keefe sought to deduct the life insurance premiums he paid. The Tax Court held that Keefe was indirectly a beneficiary of the policies on his own life and thus could not deduct the premiums. The court also addressed net operating loss deductions and overpayments of estimated tax.

Facts

Keefe and Bausman were partners in Mill River Tool Co. They had a partnership agreement stating that each would insure his own life, naming the other as beneficiary. The agreement dictated that upon the death of either partner, the insurance proceeds would be used to settle the deceased partner's interest in the partnership. Keefe paid premiums on the policies insuring his own life and attempted to deduct these premiums as business expenses on his income tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Keefe's deductions for the life insurance premiums for the years 1944 and 1945. Keefe petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court considered the deductibility of the premiums, a net operating loss deduction for 1944 based on a carry-back from 1946, and alleged overpayments made by Keefe for 1944 and 1945.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Keefe, by insuring his own life and naming his partner as beneficiary under a partnership agreement, was "directly or indirectly a beneficiary" of the life insurance policies within the meaning of Section 24(a)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, thus precluding a deduction for the premiums paid.

2. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction to consider a net loss sustained in 1946 for purposes of determining a net operating loss deduction for 1944 based on a carry-back from 1946.

3. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction to consider alleged overpayments made by

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Keefe for 1944 and 1945 in connection with payments on his declarations of estimated tax for those years.

Holding

1. No, because Keefe retained a significant interest in the policies, both through the potential to reacquire control of the policies if he outlived his partner and through the reciprocal nature of the insurance arrangement which ensured the continuation of the business.

2. Yes, because in determining tax liability for 1944, a deduction for 1944 can be based on a carry-back growing out of an undisputed net operating loss in 1946, even if the Court lacks jurisdiction over the 1946 tax year itself.

3. Yes, because Section 322(d) of the Code authorizes the Tax Court to determine the amount of overpayment even for a year for which the court finds there is also a deficiency.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 24(a)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code disallows deductions for life insurance premiums where the taxpayer is directly or indirectly a beneficiary of the policy. The court relied heavily on *Joseph Nussbaum, 19 B.T.A. 868*, which presented a similar fact pattern. The court emphasized that Keefe had a contractual right to reacquire complete ownership of the policies on his own life if he survived Bausman, making him "a" beneficiary, even if not "the" beneficiary. The court also noted the interdependent nature of the reciprocal insurance arrangement, where each partner's policy benefited the other by ensuring the business's continuity. Even if Keefe predeceased Bausman, his estate was assured of receiving cash. The court referenced, "the beneficiary contemplated by Section 215 (a) (4) [now § 24 (a) (4)] is not necessarily confined to the person named in the policy, but may include one whose interests are indirectly favorably affected thereby." The court determined that even though Section 271(b)(1) states that "the tax imposed by this chapter and the tax shown on the return shall both be determined without regard to payments on account of estimated tax," Section 322(d) allows the Tax Court to determine overpayment even when there is a deficiency.

Practical Implications

Keefe v. Commissioner clarifies that the deductibility of life insurance premiums in business contexts, especially partnerships, hinges on whether the taxpayer derives a direct or indirect benefit from the policy, not just on who is the named beneficiary. This decision highlights the importance of carefully structuring business agreements to avoid losing the deductibility of life insurance premiums. Legal practitioners should analyze the entirety of reciprocal agreements and potential benefits accruing to the insured when determining deductibility. The case also illustrates the Tax

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s authority to determine overpayments, even when a deficiency exists, offering a pathway for taxpayers to recoup excess payments on estimated taxes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.