***Newman v. Commissioner*, 28 T.C. 550 (1957)**

Alimony payments are taxable to the recipient under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 if the payments are periodic, arising from a legal obligation due to the marital relationship, and are to be paid over a period exceeding ten years from the divorce decree.

Summary

The case concerns the taxability of alimony payments received by the taxpayer. The court had to determine if the legal obligation to pay alimony arose from a separation agreement or the divorce decree. The distinction was crucial because the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 dictated that alimony payments, if to be made over a period exceeding ten years, were considered periodic payments and taxable. The court found that the obligation originated from the divorce decree itself, thus the payments, made over a period less than ten years, were not taxable to the recipient, reversing the Commissioner's assessment.

Facts

The taxpayer, Mrs. Newman, received alimony payments from her former husband following their divorce. The divorce decree, issued in February 1945, stipulated that the husband was to make annual alimony payments. A separation agreement, also from February 1945, preceded the divorce, and it also outlined the terms of the alimony payments. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) assessed income tax on the alimony payments received by Mrs. Newman from 1946 to 1953, arguing that they were taxable under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The key issue was whether the legal obligation to pay alimony derived from the separation agreement (making it periodic and taxable) or from the divorce decree (potentially making the payments non-taxable if made over less than ten years).

Procedural History

The case began when the Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed income tax deficiencies against Mrs. Newman for the years 1946-1953, based on the inclusion of alimony payments in her gross income. Mrs. Newman petitioned the Tax Court, challenging the Commissioner's assessment, arguing the payments were not taxable. The Tax Court heard the case and issued a decision in favor of Mrs. Newman.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the alimony payments received by the petitioner were taxable as income under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

2. Whether the legal obligation to pay alimony arose from the separation agreement or the divorce decree.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, the alimony payments were not taxable as income, because the legal obligation arose from the divorce decree, and the payments were to be made over a period of less than ten years.

2. The legal obligation to pay alimony arose from the divorce decree, not the separation agreement.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the effective date and the source of the legal obligation to pay alimony. The IRS argued that the separation agreement, entered into before the divorce decree, created the obligation, thereby making the payments taxable. The Tax Court, however, emphasized that the separation agreement was contingent upon the divorce decree, not the other way around: "Clearly, the separation agreement contemplated and was incident to the petitioner's action for divorce. Equally clear is the fact that the payments in question were to be made only in the event of a divorce."

The court noted that the divorce decree was the operative document that established the husband's obligation to make the alimony payments. The decree specifically addressed the alimony, the duration of the payments, and even what would happen if the recipient died before the full payment was made. The court referenced the ten-year rule in the tax code, stating that if the payments were to be made for more than ten years from the date of the decree, they were considered periodic and therefore taxable. Because the payments spanned less than ten years, they were not taxable. The court also differentiated the case from *Commissioner v. Blum*, cited by the IRS, stating that the *Blum* case was distinguishable.

The court's holding hinged on the timing and nature of the legal obligation, concluding that because the divorce decree was the event that triggered the obligation, and the payments were scheduled over a period less than ten years, they were not taxable to the recipient.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of carefully structuring separation agreements and divorce decrees to achieve specific tax outcomes. Specifically, when drafting such agreements, the language and intent of the documents is crucial. If the goal is to have alimony payments not taxable to the recipient, it's vital that the payments are structured to be completed within ten years of the divorce decree. The drafting attorney should also ensure that it is the divorce decree that establishes the legal obligation for these payments.

This case illustrates the significance of understanding the interplay between state divorce law and federal tax law. It demonstrates that the tax consequences of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

alimony payments depend on the specific language and legal effect of the divorce decree and any related agreements. Courts will examine the substance of the arrangement rather than just its form.

Attorneys advising clients on divorce settlements must be aware of this rule. The case highlights the importance of clarifying whether the payment terms in the separation agreement merge into the final decree. Furthermore, it emphasizes the need to consult with tax professionals to analyze tax consequences before finalizing divorce settlements.

Later cases have followed the precedent set in *Newman* in determining the taxability of alimony payments. The distinction between the legal origin of the obligation to pay (separation agreement versus divorce decree) remains critical.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.