Celia Goldstein v. Commissioner, 23 T.C. 927 (1955)

Gifts of stock to a trust where the beneficiaries' enjoyment is contingent on the corporation's discretion to purchase the stock are considered gifts of future interests, not eligible for the annual gift tax exclusion.

Summary

Celia Goldstein created a trust for the benefit of her children, transferring stock in a family business to trustees. The trust agreement stipulated that the corporation could, at its discretion, purchase the stock from the trustees, with proceeds distributed to the beneficiaries. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed annual gift tax exclusions for these transfers, arguing they were gifts of future interests. The Tax Court agreed, ruling that the beneficiaries' enjoyment of the gift was not immediate, but depended on the corporation's discretionary actions, making the gifts future interests and ineligible for the annual exclusion. This decision highlights the importance of determining when a beneficiary's interest in a trust is sufficiently immediate to qualify for the gift tax exclusion.

Facts

Celia Goldstein, along with her husband, transferred shares of stock in a family-owned plumbing supply corporation to trustees, Joseph Shefner and Harry Gainsley, for the benefit of three of their children. The agreement allowed the corporation to purchase shares from the trustees at the close of each fiscal year, up to a certain limit. The proceeds were to be distributed to the children. Dividends on the stock held by the trustees would be credited towards the purchase of more shares. The corporation's purchase of stock was discretionary. Goldstein claimed annual gift tax exclusions for these transfers, arguing they were present interests. The Commissioner disallowed the exclusions, deeming the gifts as of future interests.

Procedural History

Celia Goldstein filed gift tax returns for 1950 and 1951, claiming annual exclusions. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed these exclusions. The case was brought before the United States Tax Court to determine if the gifts qualified for the annual exclusion. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the 1949 agreement constituted a valid trust.

2. Whether the gifts of stock to the trustees were gifts of future interests.

Holding

1. Yes, the 1949 agreement created a valid trust because the trustees had fiduciary

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

duties over the transferred stock for the benefit of the children.

2. Yes, the gifts of stock to the trustees were gifts of future interests because the beneficiaries' enjoyment was contingent on the corporation's discretionary purchase of the stock.

Court's Reasoning

The court first addressed whether the 1949 agreement created a valid trust. The court stated that the agreement demonstrated a manifestation of intention to create a trust, with trustees managing the stock for the beneficiaries' benefit. Therefore, it determined that the agreement was a valid trust. Next, the court addressed whether the gifts were of present or future interests for gift tax purposes. The court cited the definition of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.