22 T.C. 228 (1954)

A wife living apart from her husband in a non-community property state must include her share of her husband's California community property earnings in her gross income, but not support payments derived from that income.

Summary

In *Hunt v. Commissioner*, the U.S. Tax Court addressed the tax implications of a wife's income in a community property state when she lived separately from her husband in a non-community property state. The court held that the wife was liable for tax on one-half of her husband's earnings, as California law dictated that these were community property, and a separate maintenance decree did not alter her existing interest. However, the court determined the support payments she received from those earnings were not separately taxable because they were derived from community income already subject to the community property rules. This case highlights the importance of community property laws in determining tax liabilities, even when spouses live in different jurisdictions.

Facts

Marjorie and John C. Hunt, residents of California, separated in June 1947. In September 1947, a California court ordered John to pay Marjorie $100 per month for child support. In September 1948, the court issued a decree for separate maintenance, ordering John to pay Marjorie $185 per month for her support and the child's support. Marjorie moved to Iowa in October 1948. During 1948, John, a chiropractor, earned $5,482.98 in net profits. He divided this as community property, reporting $2,741.49 as his adjusted gross income, deducting $740 as separate maintenance payments to Marjorie. Marjorie reported her total income, including the $740 in support payments, on her 1948 federal income tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a tax deficiency against Marjorie Hunt, adding one-half of her husband's net earnings ($2,741.49) to her reported income. Marjorie challenged this determination in the U.S. Tax Court. The Tax Court reviewed the facts, which were stipulated, and considered the legal arguments of both parties. The Court issued a ruling based on California community property law.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Marjorie Hunt must include in her gross income one-half of her husband's California earnings, despite her residency in a non-community property state and the separate maintenance decree.

2. Whether Marjorie Hunt must include in her gross income the periodic support and maintenance payments received from her husband.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because under California law, her husband's earnings were community property in which she held a present, existing, and equal interest, and a separate maintenance decree did not alter her interest in this community property.

2. No, because the support payments she received were made from community income on which she must share her equal tax burden.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court relied heavily on California community property law. It cited that under California law, a husband's earnings during a marriage are community property. The court emphasized the wife's present, existing, and equal interest in this community property. The court stated, "The wife's interest in community property in that State is a present, existing, and equal interest with that of her husband, during the continuance of the marriage."

The Court then cited *United States v. Malcolm*, and *Poe v. Seaborn*, to establish each spouse's equal liability for the tax on their respective share of community income. This liability, the Court reasoned, continued until death or a final divorce decree, which terminates the marriage. The Court found that neither a separate maintenance decree nor a change of domicile by the wife altered her rights to the community property earned by her husband while he remained domiciled in California. The court stated that the wife

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.