Estate of Thomas W. Tebb, Grace Tebb, Executrix, et al., v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 27 T.C. 671 (1957)

The fair market value of closely held corporate stock is a factual determination based on various factors, including earnings and book value. Moreover, when a will contest settlement results in the surviving spouse receiving a terminable interest, the marital deduction may be disallowed.

Summary

The case involved estate and income tax deficiencies related to the valuation of Pacific Lumber Agency stock and the availability of a marital deduction. The Tax Court addressed three issues: 1) the fair market value of closely held corporate stock at the time of the decedent's death, 2) whether the shares of stock received by the decedent's sons constituted taxable income to them, and 3) whether the estate was entitled to a marital deduction. The court upheld the Commissioner's valuation of the stock, finding the transfer of the stock to the sons was a testamentary disposition and not a sale, and found the settlement agreement rendered the surviving spouse's interest in the estate a terminable one, thus disallowing the marital deduction.

Facts

Thomas W. Tebb died in 1950, leaving behind his wife, Grace Tebb, and sons, Fred and Neal Tebb. At the time of his death, he owned a significant amount of stock in the Pacific Lumber Agency, a closely held corporation. Prior to his death, the decedent expressed his desire to bequeath his stock to his sons, and he entered into an agreement with them to deposit the shares in escrow. Upon his death, the escrow agent delivered the shares to Fred and Neal. The decedent's will left the residue of his estate to his wife, Grace Tebb. However, a dispute arose among the surviving spouse and the children of the decedent. They entered into a settlement agreement, which altered the distribution of the estate assets, and the surviving spouse's interest was a terminable one. In the estate tax return, the stock was included in the inventory of the decedent's assets, but a dispute arose over its valuation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in estate and income taxes. The Estate of Thomas W. Tebb and his sons, Fred and Neal Tebb, contested these deficiencies in the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court consolidated the cases, reviewed the evidence, and rendered its decision.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Commissioner erred in determining the fair market value of the decedent's stock in the Pacific Lumber Agency?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

2. Whether the transfer of the Pacific Lumber Agency stock to Fred and Neal Tebb constituted taxable income?

3. Whether the estate was entitled to a marital deduction for the interest in the decedent’s estate that passed to his wife, Grace Tebb?

Holding

1. No, because the Tax Court found sufficient evidence to support the Commissioner’s determination of the stock’s fair market value.

2. No, because the transfer of the stock was considered a testamentary disposition and not a sale, the value of the stock was not taxable income to Fred and Neal.

3. No, because the settlement agreement resulted in Grace Tebb receiving only a terminable interest in the estate, which did not qualify for the marital deduction.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied established principles for the valuation of closely held stock, emphasizing that this determination is a question of fact based on all relevant evidence, including the nature and history of the business, economic outlook, and the company’s earnings record. Regarding the second issue, the court determined that the decedent’s pre-death agreement with his sons, combined with his intent and actions, indicated a testamentary disposition of the stock, not a taxable transfer. As a result, the stock was properly included in the estate inventory. Regarding the marital deduction, the court held that the settlement agreement between Grace Tebb and the decedent’s children limited her interest in the estate, providing her only with a terminable interest. According to the court, this meant the estate was not eligible for the marital deduction, as provided in the Internal Revenue Code. The court referenced the Treasury regulations and Senate Finance Committee report, which clarified that a will contest settlement could result in the loss of the marital deduction.

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes the importance of considering all relevant factors, including a company’s earnings record and economic outlook, when valuing closely held stock. It underscores that merely relying on book value is not sufficient. Moreover, estate planning attorneys need to be mindful of how settlement agreements arising from will contests may impact the availability of the marital deduction. The case also highlights the importance of formal documentation of the transaction. Furthermore, the case illustrates how transfers of stock to family members can be considered testamentary dispositions, especially where the transferor retains control or enjoyment of the stock during their lifetime, and the transaction is entered into to effectuate an estate plan. This ruling guides estate planning and litigation to ensure appropriate tax treatment and the fulfillment of the decedent’s wishes. This case

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

demonstrates that careful consideration of these rules is essential to avoid unexpected tax liabilities and litigation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 