16 T.C. 1466 (1951)

A remainderman of a trust cannot deduct trustee commissions paid from the trust corpus upon termination and distribution, as these commissions are an obligation of the trust itself, not the remainderman.

Summary

This case addresses whether a trust remainderman can deduct trustee commissions paid out of the trust's corpus before distribution. Anstes V. Agnew, the remainderman of a testamentary trust, sought to deduct a portion of the trustee's commission charged upon the trust's termination. The Tax Court held that Agnew could not deduct the commissions because they were an obligation of the trust, a separate legal entity, and not a personal obligation of the remainderman. The court reasoned that Agnew was only entitled to the trust property remaining after all trust obligations, including trustee fees, were satisfied.

Facts

Anstes V. Agnew was the remainderman of a trust created by her grandfather's will. The will directed the trustee, St. Louis Union Trust Company, to manage the trust for the benefit of Agnew's mother during her lifetime, with the remainder to be distributed to Agnew and her sibling upon her mother's death. Upon the death of Agnew's mother, the trustee distributed the principal to Agnew and her brother in cash and securities. Before distribution, the trustee deducted its commission of 5% of the principal from the trust assets. Agnew sought to deduct half of this commission on her individual income tax return.

Procedural History

Agnew deducted a portion of the trustee's commission on her 1946 income tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed this deduction. Agnew then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether a trust remainderman can deduct trustee commissions paid from the corpus of the trust before distribution to the remainderman, where the commissions are for services related to the termination of the trust and distribution of assets.

Holding

No, because the trustee's commissions were an obligation of the trust, a separate legal entity, and not a personal obligation of the remainderman.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Tax Court reasoned that a trust is a separate juristic person from its beneficiaries. The trustee's commissions were an expense of administering the trust, and absent a testamentary directive to the contrary, administration expenses are chargeable against the principal of the trust. The court stated, "The commissions were not paid by petitioner directly and the suggestion that they were paid out of her property loses sight of the essential proposition that she owned, and was entitled to, only so much of the trust property as was left after satisfaction of its prior obligations." The court distinguished situations where a taxpayer might be able to deduct expenses related to property they own; in this case, Agnew only had a right to what remained of the trust after its obligations were satisfied. The court emphasized that there was no agreement by petitioner to pay the commission. Had she paid them, she would have been a volunteer, and therefore, the payment wouldn't have been a necessary expense for her.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that trustee commissions paid from a trust's corpus are generally deductible by the trust itself, not the beneficiaries receiving distributions. Attorneys advising trust beneficiaries should inform them that they cannot deduct these commissions on their personal income tax returns. This decision emphasizes the separate legal status of a trust and the principle that beneficiaries are only entitled to the net value of the trust assets after all obligations are satisfied. Later cases citing Agnew often involve disputes over who is the proper party to deduct expenses related to trust administration or property management, reinforcing the importance of determining the direct obligor of the expense.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.