Baker v. Commissioner, 17 T.C. 1610 (1952)

Payments made as part of a divorce or separation agreement are deductible by the payor spouse and taxable to the recipient spouse only if they qualify as periodic payments, and life insurance premiums paid by the payor spouse are not deductible as alimony if the policies serve as collateral security for the payment of alimony.

Summary

F. Ellsworth Baker sought to deduct payments made to his former wife, Viva, under a separation agreement that was later incorporated into their divorce decree. The Tax Court disallowed deductions for a lump-sum payment made before the divorce, monthly payments made after the divorce because they were considered installment payments of a principal sum payable in under ten years, and life insurance premiums paid on policies where Viva was the beneficiary, as the policies served as collateral security for the alimony payments. The court reasoned that the initial payment was not a periodic payment, the subsequent monthly payments did not meet the statutory requirements for deductibility, and the life insurance premiums did not constitute alimony payments.

Facts

- F. Ellsworth Baker and Viva entered into a separation agreement on July 17, 1946, which was later incorporated into a divorce decree.
- Baker made a $3,000 payment to Viva on the date the separation agreement was signed.
- The agreement stipulated monthly payments to Viva, initially $300 for the first year and $200 thereafter, subject to potential reductions based on Baker's income, but not below $150 per month.
- The agreement also stipulated that any reduction in monthly payments would be repaid starting July 17, 1952, at $200 per month.
- Baker was required to designate Viva as the irrevocable beneficiary of certain life insurance policies, which were to be returned to him upon the agreement's expiration.
- Baker delivered two life insurance policies with a total face value of $15,000 to Viva and paid the premiums on these policies in 1946.
- Viva remarried in September 1949, causing the insurance policies to be returned to Baker.

Procedural History

Baker claimed deductions for the payments made to Viva and the life insurance premiums on his tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed these deductions. Baker petitioned the Tax Court for review of the Commissioner's determination.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $3,000 payment made on the date of the separation agreement is deductible by the petitioner.
2. Whether the monthly payments made by the petitioner to Viva after the divorce decree are deductible as periodic payments under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.
3. Whether the life insurance premiums paid by the petitioner on policies where his former wife was the beneficiary constitute allowable deductions under Section 23(u) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the payment was a lump-sum payment made for the benefit of the wife prior to divorce and not a periodic payment.
2. No, because the monthly payments were considered installment payments of a principal sum payable within a period of less than 10 years.
3. No, because the insurance policies served as collateral security for the alimony payments, and the payment of premiums did not extend the duration of the agreement beyond ten years.

Court’s Reasoning

- Regarding the $3,000 payment, the court found no statutory basis for allowing the deduction, as it was a lump-sum payment prior to the divorce and not a periodic payment under Section 22(k).
- The court determined that the monthly payments were essentially installment payments of a principal sum ($15,600) to be paid within a period of less than 10 years. Citing precedent, the court stated that such installment payments are not deductible under Section 23(u).
- The court reasoned that the life insurance policies served as collateral security for the alimony payments and did not increase the agreement’s duration. The court distinguished the case from others, noting that the security for the taxpayer’s obligation does not give the divorced wife more than was provided in the agreement, citing *Blummenthal v. Commissioner*, 183 F.2d 15. Even if the premiums were deductible as alimony, the 10-year rule would still preclude the deduction.

Practical Implications

- This case illustrates the importance of structuring divorce or separation agreements to meet the specific requirements of Sections 22(k) and 23(u) of the Internal Revenue Code to ensure the deductibility of alimony payments.
- Lump-sum payments made before a divorce are generally not deductible as alimony.
- Payments considered installment payments of a principal sum, especially those

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

payable within ten years, are not deductible.
- The use of life insurance policies as collateral security for alimony payments generally does not make the premiums deductible as alimony.
- Later cases have cited *Baker v. Commissioner* for the proposition that payments must be structured carefully to qualify as deductible alimony and that life insurance premiums are not deductible if the policies serve primarily as security.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.