25 T.C. 1258 (1956)

Property transferred to a trust where the decedent retained a life estate or a reversionary interest, or where the interest was conditioned on survivorship of the decedent, is includible in the decedent's gross estate for estate tax purposes, and bequests cannot be deducted if the estate lacks assets to pay them.

Summary

The Estate of Herman Hohensee, Sr. contested an estate tax deficiency determined by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Hohensee and his wife created an inter vivos trust, with Hohensee retaining a life estate in a portion and a reversionary life estate in the remainder. The couple also transferred stock to the same trust, with each retaining income for life, and the survivor receiving the entire income for life. The court held that the value of property transferred with retained interests was includible in Hohensee's gross estate. Further, it held that bequests to the surviving spouse and to charities were not deductible because the estate lacked sufficient assets to satisfy them after debts, expenses, and taxes.

Facts

Herman Hohensee, Sr. and his wife created an irrevocable trust in 1933, with their children as trustees. Hohensee transferred real property to the trust, retaining a life estate in one half and a reversionary life estate in the remainder after his wife's life. They each transferred shares of stock in a family corporation to the trust, with each to receive one-half of the income for life and the entire income to the survivor for the remainder of their life. Hohensee died on November 10, 1949, leaving a will that provided for distribution of the entire residue of the general estate to his wife after small charitable bequests. The general estate's assets were insufficient to pay all claims, expenses, and taxes, and the trust advanced funds to the estate to cover these obligations. The estate claimed marital and charitable deductions, which the Commissioner disallowed.

Procedural History

The estate filed a federal estate tax return. The Commissioner determined a deficiency and disallowed the claimed marital and charitable deductions. The estate contested the deficiency in the U.S. Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the contribution of property to an inter vivos trust, jointly created by decedent and his wife, and the retention of certain income interests therein, require inclusion of any part of the corpus in his gross estate, and if so, what part?

2. Whether the estate is entitled to the marital deduction?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

3. Whether certain charitable bequests are deductible?

Holding

1. Yes, the value of the property transferred to the trust, with the retained life estate and reversionary interest, is includible in the gross estate, reduced by the value of the outstanding income interest of the wife.

2. No, the estate is not entitled to a marital deduction, as the surviving spouse's interest was a terminable interest.

3. No, the estate is not entitled to charitable deductions, as the general estate's assets were insufficient to pay the bequests.

Court's Reasoning

The court determined that the real estate transferred to the trust was includible in the gross estate because the decedent retained, in effect, a life estate in one half and a reversionary life estate in the remainder after the prior estate for his wife's life. The court cited the statute stating that such an interest is one "not ascertainable without reference to his death." The court noted that the value of the transfer for estate tax purposes is determined by reducing the value of the transferred property by the amount of the outstanding income interest in the wife. The court found that even if existing law at the time of the decedent's death was unclear, the Technical Changes Act of 1949 clarified the statute to include a life interest following the death of another person. The court also ruled that the value of the personal property in the trust was includible in the estate because the income was reserved to the decedent for life. The court further denied the marital deduction because the widow's interest was terminable as the facts showed the expenses and taxes more than consumed the estate assets. Finally, the court denied the charitable deduction because the assets of the estate were not sufficient to pay these bequests.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of understanding the estate tax implications of trusts where the grantor retains control or benefits. The decision clarifies that retaining a life estate, even a reversionary one or one contingent on survivorship of another, triggers estate tax inclusion. It also highlights that the availability of marital and charitable deductions hinges on the actual transfer of assets to the spouse or charity, and that bequests may not qualify if estate assets are insufficient after payment of debts and taxes. This case serves as a warning to estate planners to carefully structure trusts to avoid unintended tax consequences, and emphasizes the necessity of having sufficient liquid assets in an estate to satisfy bequests for marital and charitable deductions to apply.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.