Maurice L. Jaffe, 13 T.C. 361 (1949)

Payments made by a husband to his former wife under a written agreement are deductible, even if the agreement was executed years after the divorce, provided that the agreement memorializes a pre-existing, enforceable oral agreement made during the marriage and related to the divorce.

Summary

The case concerns the deductibility of alimony payments made by a husband to his divorced wife under the Internal Revenue Code. The issue was whether a written agreement, executed several years after the divorce, could be considered "incident" to the divorce, thus allowing the husband to deduct the payments. The Tax Court held that the payments were deductible because the written agreement merely formalized a pre-existing, legally binding oral agreement made during the marriage and related to the divorce. The court emphasized that the timing of the written agreement, in relation to the divorce decree, was not the controlling factor; the existence of an enforceable obligation was.

Facts

Maurice Jaffe and his former wife, Ethyl, entered into an oral agreement before their divorce, where Maurice agreed to make certain payments for Ethyl's support. Their divorce was finalized in April 1940, and the divorce decree did not mention any alimony. However, the oral agreement regarding alimony remained in effect. Five years later, in April 1945, the parties reduced the oral agreement to writing. Maurice sought to deduct the alimony payments made under the 1945 written agreement from his income. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction, arguing that the written agreement was not "incident" to the divorce because it was executed several years after the decree.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied Maurice Jaffe's claimed deduction for alimony payments. Jaffe appealed to the Tax Court. The Tax Court sided with Jaffe, finding that the payments were deductible. The court reviewed the facts and the relevant statutes, ultimately concluding that the written agreement was sufficiently related to the divorce to permit the deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the husband was under a legal obligation to make alimony payments, as a condition for deducting them.

2. Whether the written agreement, executed five years after the divorce decree, was "incident" to the divorce, as required by the relevant tax code provisions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the husband was under a legal obligation to make the payments pursuant to an enforceable oral agreement made before the divorce.

2. Yes, because the written agreement, executed five years after the divorce, was "incident" to the divorce because it formalized an existing legal obligation related to the divorce.

Court's Reasoning

The court began by noting that sections 22(k) and 23(u) of the Internal Revenue Code allowed a husband to deduct payments made to his divorced wife if made in discharge of a legal obligation imposed by a written instrument incident to the divorce. The Commissioner argued that the absence of a written agreement at the time of the divorce, and the five-year gap before the agreement was formalized in writing, meant the agreement was not incident to the divorce. However, the court found that an oral agreement for support existed before the divorce, establishing a legal obligation under Illinois law. The court found that the timing of the written agreement, in relation to the divorce decree, was not the controlling factor; the existence of an enforceable obligation was.

The court distinguished the case from situations where there was no pre-existing agreement, oral or otherwise, at the time of the divorce. It cited precedent where subsequent agreements, even long after a divorce, were considered "incident" to the divorce when they were amendments or clarifications of a prior agreement or settled disputes related to prior agreements. The court emphasized that the written agreement merely put into writing an existing obligation.

The court quoted the Second Circuit's holding in *Lerner v. Commissioner*: "The term 'written instrument incident to such divorce' was designed, we think, only to insure adequate proof of the existence of the obligation when divorce has occurred, and not to deny relief to the husband when merely legal formalities have not been rendered their full due."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the requirements for the deductibility of alimony payments where the written agreement post-dates the divorce. It is important that there was a valid, enforceable agreement in place when the parties divorced. The court's emphasis on the existence of an enforceable obligation prior to the divorce, even if only oral, is key. Practitioners should advise clients to ensure any agreements regarding support are in place before the divorce. Additionally, if such an agreement is oral, it should be documented in writing as soon as possible to establish adequate proof of the obligation, as per the holding in *Lerner v. Commissioner*. This case signals that substance, not just the form, governs the tax treatment of alimony. This case is still

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

cited when considering the deductibility of alimony, providing guidance on the timing of written agreements and the importance of pre-existing obligations.

Meta Description

The case establishes that alimony payments can be deductible even if the written agreement comes after the divorce, if it memorializes a pre-existing, enforceable oral agreement related to the divorce.

Tags

Jaffe, Tax Court, 1949, Alimony, Divorce, Deductibility, Written agreement

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.