Estate of Richard C. du Pont v. Commissioner, 18 T.C. 1101 (1952)

For estate tax purposes, life insurance policies on another's life owned by the decedent are valued at their replacement cost, and the term "member of the armed forces" for estate tax exemption does not include civilian experts, even those serving military functions.

Summary

This case concerns the valuation of life insurance policies for estate tax purposes and the interpretation of Section 939 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provided an estate tax exemption for certain members of the armed forces who died during a specific period. The Tax Court held that the life insurance policies owned by the decedent on his father's life should be valued at their replacement cost, not cash surrender value. The court further ruled that the decedent, despite serving as a special assistant to the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, did not qualify as a "member of the armed forces" because he served in a civilian capacity; therefore, his estate was not entitled to the estate tax exemption.

Facts

Richard C. du Pont, the decedent, owned five single-premium life insurance policies on his father's life. He also owned a one-fifth interest in a trust whose sole assets were seventeen life insurance policies on his father's life. At the time of his death, his father was still alive. Du Pont served as a special assistant to General H.H. Arnold, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Air Forces, in a civilian capacity. He was an expert in glider activities. He died while participating as an observer in the testing of an experimental transport glider.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the decedent's estate tax. The estate petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination. The Tax Court addressed two issues: the valuation of the life insurance policies and the applicability of the estate tax exemption under Section 939 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether life insurance policies owned by the decedent on the life of another should be valued at their replacement cost or cash surrender value for estate tax purposes.

2. Whether the decedent, a civilian special assistant to the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, qualifies as a "member of the armed forces" under Section 939 of the Internal Revenue Code, thereby entitling his estate to an estate tax exemption.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because replacement cost better reflects the actual value of the policies than the cash surrender value.

2. No, because the decedent served in a civilian capacity and the estate tax exemption is strictly limited to formal members of the armed forces.

Court's Reasoning

Regarding the valuation of the life insurance policies, the court relied on Supreme Court precedent (Guggenheim v. Rasquin, Powers v. Commissioner, United States v. Ryerson) that established replacement cost as the proper measure of value for gift tax purposes. The court found no compelling reason why the method of transfer (gift vs. death) should significantly alter the value of the policies. Thus, replacement cost was deemed the more accurate reflection of the policies' value in the estate.

Concerning the estate tax exemption, the court emphasized that Section 939 was an exemption statute and therefore must be strictly construed. The court considered the legislative history, quoting Senator George's statement that the amendment was intended to protect the estates of "soldiers" killed in action. Despite du Pont's valuable service and close association with the military, the court held that his civilian status precluded him from being considered a "member of the armed forces" for the purposes of the exemption. The court stated, "The section of the Code which is here under review, is clearly an exemption from tax and as such is to be strictly limited to the class of taxpayers designated."

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that life insurance policies are valued at replacement cost for estate tax purposes, aligning the valuation method with that used for gift tax. It also highlights the importance of strictly interpreting tax exemptions. The ruling makes it clear that even individuals who perform essential functions for the military, but are not formally enlisted or commissioned, do not qualify for tax exemptions specifically designed for members of the armed forces. Later cases would likely continue to adhere to a strict construction of similar tax exemption statutes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.