19 T.C. 865 (1953)

r
r

Payments made to a divorced spouse under a divorce decree are includible in the recipient’s gross income if the payments discharge a legal obligation arising from the marital or family relationship, even if the payments are linked to a waiver of property claims.

r
r

Summary

r

Julia Nathan received payments from her former husband, Sol Nathan, pursuant to a divorce decree. The IRS determined that these payments were taxable income to her under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code. Julia argued that the payments were not made because of the marital relationship but as payment for her ownership interest in her husband’s business. The Tax Court held that the payments were indeed made in discharge of a legal obligation arising from the marital relationship and were therefore taxable income to Julia. The court emphasized that Julia received substantial other benefits in the divorce settlement and that her claim to a business interest was weak.

r
r

Facts

r

Julia and Sol Nathan married in 1932 and had three children. During the marriage, Julia assisted Sol in his business, B & Sales, but she never contributed capital. Sol promised Julia a partnership, but it never materialized. The couple separated in 1941 or 1942, and Sol paid Julia $125 per week for support. In 1944, they entered into a written agreement that settled their property rights and provided for the custody and maintenance of their children. The agreement stipulated that Sol would pay Julia $17,500 per year, with 40% designated for her and the remainder for the children. Julia waived any claims to Sol’s business and dower rights. A divorce decree was granted in June 1944, incorporating the agreement. Julia received payments under the decree in 1944-1947.

r
r

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Procedural History

r

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Julia's income tax for 1944-1947, based on the payments she received from Sol. Julia petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, finding the payments taxable to Julia under Section 22(k).

r
r

Issue(s)

r

Whether payments made to Julia by her former husband, Sol, pursuant to a divorce decree, are includible in Julia's gross income under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code, as payments made in discharge of a legal obligation arising from the marital or family relationship, or whether they constitute payment for her alleged ownership interest in Sol's business.

r
r

Holding

r

No, because the payments were made in discharge of a legal obligation arising from the marital or family relationship and are thus includible in Julia's gross income under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.

r
r

Court's Reasoning

r

The court reasoned that Julia failed to disprove the Commissioner's determination that the payments were made due to the marital relationship. The court distinguished *Frank J. DuBane*, noting that in that case, the agreement was made after the divorce and the decree did not stipulate payments. The court found *Floyd H. Brown* persuasive, where similar payments were held to discharge marital obligations despite arguments that they settled property rights. The court emphasized that Julia received significant other benefits, including a home,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

transportation costs, a car, life insurance, and attorney fees, totaling over $38,000. The court deemed Julia’s claim to a business interest

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.