16 T.C. 1418 (1951)

Lump-sum payments made pursuant to a divorce agreement, such as for the purchase of a home or payment of the former spouse's legal fees, are not considered periodic payments and are therefore not deductible as alimony under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In *Baer v. Commissioner*, the Tax Court addressed whether a husband could deduct certain payments made to his former wife and her attorneys as periodic alimony payments following their divorce. The payments included a lump sum for a house, her legal fees, and his own legal fees. The court held that the lump-sum payments for the house and the wife's legal fees were not periodic payments and thus not deductible. Additionally, the court determined that the husband's legal fees were not deductible as expenses for the conservation of income-producing property.

Facts

Arthur B. Baer divorced his wife, Mary E. Baer, in 1947. Incident to the divorce, they entered into an agreement where Arthur agreed to pay Mary $35,000 to purchase a home for her and their daughter, $20,000 for her attorneys' fees, and ongoing monthly payments. Arthur also paid $16,500 to his own attorneys for services related to the divorce and settlement negotiations. Arthur sought to deduct these payments on his 1947 income tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Baer's income tax for 1947, disallowing the deductions for the payments made to his former wife and her attorneys, as well as his own legal fees. Baer petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $35,000 payment to the former wife for the purchase of a home is a deductible periodic payment under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.

2. Whether the $20,000 payment to the former wife's attorneys is a deductible periodic payment under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.

3. Whether the $16,500 in legal fees paid by the husband to his own attorneys is deductible as an expense for the management, conservation, or maintenance of property held for the production of income under Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the $35,000 payment was a lump-sum payment for a specific purpose (purchasing a home) and not a periodic payment as contemplated by the statute.

2. No, because the $20,000 payment was a lump-sum payment for a specific purpose (payment of legal fees) and not a periodic payment as contemplated by the statute.

3. No, because the legal fees were related to a personal matter (the divorce) and not directly related to the management, conservation, or maintenance of income-producing property.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the $35,000 payment for the house and the $20,000 payment for attorneys' fees were not "periodic payments" within the meaning of Section 22(k). The court emphasized the ordinary connotation of "periodic" which "calls for payments in sequence, and distinguishes any payments standing alone." The court distinguished these lump-sum payments from the ongoing monthly payments, which were clearly periodic. The court stated it considered an initial lump-sum payment "in a different category" from periodic payments "for current support." As to the husband's legal fees, the court relied on *Lindsay C. Howard, 16 T.C. 157* and held that the expenses were personal in nature and not deductible under Section 23(a)(2), even if they indirectly related to conserving income-producing property. The court emphasized that the fees stemmed from a personal relationship and were not directly tied to the management or maintenance of property.

Practical Implications

Baer v. Commissioner clarifies the distinction between lump-sum payments and periodic payments in the context of divorce settlements and their tax implications. It reinforces that for payments to qualify as deductible alimony, they must be part of a recurring series, not isolated, one-time payments, even if made pursuant to a divorce agreement. The case also illustrates the difficulty in deducting legal fees incurred during a divorce, even when a party argues that those fees were necessary to protect income-producing assets. Attorneys drafting divorce settlements must carefully structure payments to ensure they meet the requirements for deductibility, and clients should be advised that legal fees related to divorce are generally considered non-deductible personal expenses. Later cases cite Baer for the proposition that a key factor in determining whether payments are periodic is whether they are part of a sequence of payments, rather than isolated lump sums.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.