16 T.C. 743 (1951)

A power of appointment is not considered "exercised" for estate tax purposes under Section 403(d)(3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 if the attempted appointment violates the applicable rule against perpetuities and is therefore void under state law.

Summary

This case addresses whether a decedent's attempt to exercise a power of appointment should be considered an "exercise" of that power for federal estate tax purposes, even though the attempted appointment violated Pennsylvania's rule against perpetuities. The Tax Court held that because the appointment was void ab initio under state law, the power was not "exercised" within the meaning of the tax code, and the value of the property subject to the power should not be included in the decedent's gross estate. The court emphasized that a void appointment lacks legal significance and cannot be considered an effective act relating to property.

Facts

Edith Wilson Paul (decedent) possessed a general testamentary power of appointment over a portion of her mother's (the donor's) estate. The donor's will granted Edith a life estate with the power to appoint the remainder. In her will, Edith attempted to appoint the remainder in trust, dividing it into eight equal parts for her children, with each child receiving income for life and the remainder going to their issue. Five of Edith's children were born after the donor's death. The Orphans' Court of Philadelphia County determined that the appointment to the issue of these five children violated the rule against perpetuities under Pennsylvania law and was therefore void.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Edith's estate tax, arguing that the value of the remainder interests should be included in her gross estate because she exercised the power of appointment. The estate challenged this determination, arguing that the attempted appointment was void and therefore not an exercise of the power. The Tax Court reviewed the case de novo.

Issue(s)

Whether the decedent's attempt to appoint remainder interests, which was deemed void under Pennsylvania's rule against perpetuities, constitutes an "exercise" of the power of appointment for the purposes of Section 403(d)(3) of the Revenue Act of 1942.

Holding

No, because the attempted appointment was a legal nullity from its inception,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

possessing no legal significance due to the violation of the rule against perpetuities. Thus, the power of appointment was not “exercised” for the purpose of federal estate tax law.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the validity of the appointment must be determined under Pennsylvania law. It found that the attempted appointment violated the rule against perpetuities because the remainder interests were not certain to vest within the permissible period (life in being plus 21 years). The court explained that because the five children were born after the donor’s death, it was possible that their issue would not be determined until more than 21 years after the death of a life in being at the time the power was created. The court emphasized that the remainder interests vested in issue before the death of Edith were not indefeasibly vested but rather vested subject to open, which did not satisfy the rule against perpetuities. Quoting the House Report accompanying the 1942 Revenue Act, the court stated that a power of appointment is “an authority to do some act in relation to property which the owner, granting such power, might himself do.” Because the appointment was void from the beginning, it had no legal effect on the disposition of the property, and thus was not an exercise of the power.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that for estate tax purposes, an attempt to exercise a power of appointment that results in a void appointment due to the rule against perpetuities is not considered an “exercise” of the power. This means that the value of the property subject to the power will not be included in the decedent’s gross estate under Section 403(d)(3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 (for powers created before the Act). Attorneys must carefully analyze the validity of any attempted appointment under applicable state property law, especially concerning the rule against perpetuities, to determine its estate tax consequences. Later cases will likely cite this decision when determining the tax implications of powers of appointment, reinforcing the principle that a void act lacks legal significance for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.