***Powell v. Commissioner*, 10 T.C.M. (CCH) 879 (1951)**

A charitable organization may lose its tax-exempt status if its net earnings inure to the benefit of a private individual, even if the organization was established with a charitable purpose.

Summary

The case of *Powell v. Commissioner* revolves around a charitable foundation, established with a gift that stipulated that a portion of the income be paid to a private individual. The court found that the foundation, by paying the income beneficiary more than the actual income generated by the specific assets charged for her benefit, caused a portion of its general assets' net earnings to improperly inure to the individual's benefit. This contravened the requirements for tax exemption under section 101(6) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court emphasized that the taxpayer must prove it met the conditions for the exemption and also addresses the failure to file a timely tax return, resulting in a penalty.

Facts

William L. Powell established a charitable foundation with a gift of government bonds. The donor stipulated that one-half the income from the bonds, or the proceeds, be donated to charitable or religious enterprises. The other half was to be added to the corpus. However, income from specific bonds was to be paid to his wife, Ella P. Powell, during her lifetime. The foundation intermingled the specific assets with its general assets, which were invested in mortgage loans. It was shown that the income beneficiary, Ella P. Powell, was paid more than the income generated by the specific assets designated for her benefit. Furthermore, the foundation did not file its return until December 4, 1950, despite the fiscal year ending January 31, 1950, and the statute requiring the filing of the return within the third month following the fiscal year end.

Procedural History

The case was heard before the United States Tax Court. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the foundation was not entitled to tax exemption under section 101(6). The foundation disputed this determination, which led to the Tax Court review. The Tax Court ultimately agreed with the Commissioner and upheld the denial of the tax exemption and assessed a penalty for the late filing of the tax return.

Issue(s)

1. Whether any part of the net earnings of the foundation inured to the benefit of a private individual, thereby preventing the foundation from obtaining tax exemption under section 101(6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether the foundation was subject to a penalty for failing to file its tax return in a timely manner.

Holding

1. Yes, because the foundation paid the income beneficiary more than the income generated by the specifically designated assets, a portion of its general assets' net earnings improperly inured to her benefit.

2. Yes, because the foundation failed to file its tax return within the prescribed timeframe and did not establish "reasonable cause" for the delay.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied section 101(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, which stipulates the requirements for tax exemption for charitable organizations, specifically that "no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual." The court held that the foundation failed to prove that the income paid to the income beneficiary, Ella P. Powell, did not exceed the actual income generated by the assets designated for her benefit. The court emphasized that the specific assets dedicated to the income beneficiary were not segregated from the general assets, making it impossible to determine the actual income of those specific assets. Given evidence of losses and expenses on the investments of the general assets, the court concluded that the income beneficiary was paid more than her designated portion, thus violating the inurement prohibition.

The court cited precedent that established that a charitable trust can have income paid to an individual for a stated term, but that the payments must be limited to the income from specific assets, such as in *Hederer v. Stockton*, 260 U.S. 3 (1922). The Court found that by not segregating the assets, the Foundation failed to prove it met the terms of this exception. Finally, the court upheld the Commissioner's penalty for the late filing of the return, as the foundation had not shown "reasonable cause" for the delay.

Practical Implications

This case provides a direct application of the "inurement" prohibition found in the tax code governing charitable organizations. Legal professionals should advise their clients organizing charities to maintain strict separation of assets if the organization intends to make payments to private individuals from designated assets. Any commingling of funds or failure to accurately account for income and expenses can lead to a loss of tax-exempt status. Specifically, organizations must carefully monitor the income generated from assets designated to benefit private individuals to ensure compliance. The court also reinforced the need to comply with filing deadlines and penalties, and failure to do so may result in additional liabilities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.