21 T.C. 826 (1954)

Payments made by a third party on behalf of a former spouse to fulfill an alimony obligation are considered taxable alimony income to the recipient under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In *Pierson v. Commissioner*, the U.S. Tax Court addressed whether a payment made by a corporation, of which the petitioner’s former husband was an officer, constituted taxable alimony income to the petitioner. The court held that the payment, made to satisfy the ex-husband’s alimony obligation, was indeed taxable to the petitioner under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code, regardless of whether the ex-husband reimbursed the corporation. Additionally, the court upheld a penalty for the petitioner’s failure to file a tax return for the year in question. The ruling clarifies the scope of alimony income and the responsibility for filing tax returns.

Facts

Marcia P. Pierson (Petitioner) divorced Arthur N. Pierson, Jr. in 1944. The divorce decree stipulated that Mr. Pierson, Jr. was to pay Ms. Pierson $100 per week in alimony. Payments were made to Ms. Pierson by both Mr. Pierson, Jr. and the Arthur N. Pierson Corporation, of which Mr. Pierson, Jr. was an officer. In 1948, Ms. Pierson received $2,100 from the corporation and did not file a tax return for that year. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a tax deficiency and a penalty for failure to file a return, claiming that the $2,100 payment constituted alimony income.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in income tax for the years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1949. The parties agreed on the proper amounts for those years. The Commissioner also determined a deficiency for 1948, and a penalty for failure to file a return for that year. The case was brought before the United States Tax Court to resolve the disputed 1948 tax liability and the penalty assessment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $1,100 payment received by the petitioner from the Arthur N. Pierson Corporation in 1948 constituted taxable alimony income under section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code.

2. Whether the Commissioner of Internal Revenue correctly imposed a penalty under section 291(a) of the Code for the petitioner’s failure to file a return for the taxable year 1948.

Holding

1. Yes, because the payment from the corporation satisfied the ex-husband's alimony obligation and thus constituted taxable alimony income under Section 22(k).

2. Yes, because the petitioner failed to show reasonable cause for not filing a tax return.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the nature of the payment. The key factor was that the corporation's payment to Ms. Pierson was made in satisfaction of her former husband's alimony obligation as set forth in the divorce decree. The court stated that the source of the payment did not matter, only its purpose, which was to satisfy the alimony obligation. The court determined that the $1,100 payment was received by the Petitioner in satisfaction of her former husband's obligation, making it taxable to her as alimony income under section 22 (k) of the Code. The court was not concerned with the corporation's reimbursement from the former husband.

The court also upheld the penalty. The petitioner had not shown reasonable cause for failing to file her tax return, thus, the penalty was appropriate.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that the substance of a transaction, not its form, determines its tax consequences. For tax purposes, payments from a third party that are made in satisfaction of a legally obligated alimony payment are considered alimony to the recipient. This has implications for divorce settlements and financial arrangements. Tax attorneys should advise their clients on how these payments are treated by the IRS. Business owners should also consider the tax ramifications when providing financial support for officers to meet personal financial obligations. The holding in *Pierson* has been cited in subsequent cases dealing with the definition of alimony and the tax treatment of payments made pursuant to divorce decrees.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.