Robert Lehman, 17 T.C. 652 (1951)

When a divorce agreement explicitly allocates a percentage of support payments to the ex-spouse and children, that allocation governs the determination of deductible alimony, even if the agreement also suggests savings for future needs.

Summary

Robert Lehman sought to deduct alimony payments made to his former wife. The IRS argued that a portion of these payments, ostensibly for the wife's support, were actually intended for the children's future needs and thus not deductible. The Tax Court held that the divorce agreement explicitly allocated 70% of the payments for the wife's support and 30% for the children, and this allocation was controlling. A suggestion within the agreement to save excess funds did not alter the character of the payments as allocated.

Facts

Robert Lehman and his former wife, Mary, entered into a divorce agreement. Subparagraph B stipulated that 70% of the total support payments were for Mary's support and 30% were for the children's support. Subparagraph F suggested that Mary should save any amount exceeding $200 per month (after taxes) from the total support payments for both herself and the children. Lehman made payments to Mary in 1945 and 1946, and sought to deduct the portions he claimed were for her support.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed a portion of Lehman's claimed alimony deductions. Lehman petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination, arguing that the divorce agreement clearly allocated the support payments. The Tax Court reviewed the terms of the agreement to determine the proper allocation of the payments and the corresponding deductible amount.

Issue(s)

Whether, under sections 23(u) and 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code, a portion of support payments made by a taxpayer to his former wife is non-deductible if the divorce agreement suggests saving a portion of the payments for future needs, despite a clear allocation of funds for spousal and child support within the agreement.

Holding

No, because the divorce agreement explicitly allocated 70% of the total support payments to the former wife's support and 30% to the children. The suggestion within the agreement to save excess funds did not alter the character of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

payments as allocated for tax deduction purposes.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court focused on interpreting the divorce agreement as a whole. It noted that subparagraph B of the agreement specifically allocated 70% of the payments to the wife and 30% to the children. The court reasoned that subparagraph F, which suggested saving amounts above $200 per month, did not override the explicit allocation in subparagraph B. The court stated that the provision in subparagraph F “does not change the basic provision in subparagraph B that the indicated proportion of petitioner’s total payments is for the support of his former wife.” It found that the savings provision was merely a recommendation by the petitioner to his former wife, suggesting she save funds for future needs, given the potential variability in his income. The court considered the petitioner’s intent to impress upon his divorced wife that it would be prudent for her to establish savings during years when payments were more than adequate. The court also cited legal treatises on trusts to further support its interpretation of the agreement.

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes the importance of clear and unambiguous language in divorce agreements, particularly regarding the allocation of support payments between a former spouse and children. It clarifies that explicit allocation clauses are generally controlling for tax purposes, even if other provisions suggest alternative uses for the funds. Attorneys drafting divorce agreements should ensure that the intended tax consequences are clearly reflected in the agreement’s language. The case suggests that precatory language (e.g., recommendations or suggestions) will not override clear directives concerning the allocation of payments. Subsequent cases would likely distinguish Lehman if the agreement lacked a clear allocation of funds between spousal and child support or if the agreement mandated a specific use of the funds that contradicted the stated allocation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.