Estate of Carruth, 28 T.C. 880 (1957)

Income in respect of a decedent (IRD), although included in the gross income of the trust, is not automatically included in the gross income of the trust's beneficiary if it is not actually distributed to the beneficiary based on the terms of the trust instrument.

Summary

The case involves the income tax liability of Ostella Carruth, a beneficiary of the L.H. Carruth Estate Trust. The IRS determined deficiencies related to farm rents earned but unpaid before L.H. Carruth's death, and the treatment of reserves for repairs and trustee commissions set aside by the trust. The Tax Court held that the unpaid farm rents, considered income in respect of a decedent (IRD), were not taxable to Ostella Carruth because they were not distributed to her. The court also ruled that the reserves for repairs and trustee commissions, which the trustees properly withheld based on their broad powers under the trust instrument, were not includible in Ostella Carruth's gross income because she did not have a present right to receive them. This case clarifies the tax treatment of IRD and the importance of the trust instrument in determining beneficiary income.

Facts

L.H. Carruth owned farms leased for cash. At his death, some rents were earned but unpaid. His will established a trust, with Ostella Carruth as trustee and beneficiary. The trust collected the unpaid farm rents. The trust's income tax return included these rents. The trust set aside reserves for repairs and trustee commissions. The IRS determined that the rents, reserves, and other items should be included in Ostella Carruth's gross income. A state court determined the trustees had the power to withhold amounts for repairs.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a deficiency notice to Ostella Carruth's estate. The estate contested the IRS's determination in the Tax Court. The Tax Court heard the case and made findings of fact based on stipulated facts and exhibits. The court considered whether the unpaid farm rents, the reserves for repairs, and the reserve for trustee's commission were correctly included in the beneficiary's gross income. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the taxpayer.

Issue(s)

1. Whether farm rents earned but unpaid before L.H. Carruth's death, collected by the trust before January 1, 1950, are includible in Ostella Carruth's income.

2. Whether a reserve for repairs set aside by the trust should be allowed as a deduction in computing the amount distributable by the trust and taxable to the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

beneficiary.

3. Whether a reserve for trustee's commission set aside by the trust should be allowed as a deduction in computing the amount distributable by the trust and taxable to the beneficiary.

Holding

1. No, because the rentals were IRD and not considered income to the beneficiary under the law because they were not distributed to her.

2. No, because under the trust instrument, and the subsequent state court case, Ostella Carruth did not have the present right to receive the funds held in reserve.

3. No, because under the trust instrument, Ostella Carruth did not have the present right to receive funds held in reserve.

Court's Reasoning

The court considered the tax treatment of income in respect of a decedent (IRD) under Section 126 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The court referenced the case, Estate of Ralph R. Huesman, 16 T. C. 656, which addressed the question of whether IRD taxed to an estate could also be taxed to a beneficiary. The court cited prior cases that held that Section 126 income is not to be taxed again to a beneficiary merely because it passed through the trust. The court held that the farm rentals, though included in the gross estate and the trust's income, were not automatically includible in Ostella Carruth's income because she did not have a present right to receive them. The court also analyzed whether the trustees' actions in setting aside the reserves for repairs and trustee commissions affected Ostella Carruth's tax liability. Because the trustees had the power to do so under the broad terms of the will, and a state court confirmed their authority, the court found that Ostella Carruth did not have a present right to receive those funds and they were not includible in her income.

The court stated, "Nowhere in the above-quoted sections of the Code and Regulations is provision made for taxing section 126 income to any person other than the rightful recipient, or to a distributee where an estate receives such income and currently distributes it."

Practical Implications

This case is important because it emphasizes that IRD is not automatically taxed to the beneficiary, but is taxed to the entity that actually receives it, unless it is distributed to a beneficiary. The tax treatment depends on the trust instrument and whether the beneficiary has the right to receive the income. This case guides how similar cases should be analyzed, particularly regarding the interplay of Sections 126 and 162 of the Internal Revenue Code. It influences legal practice by

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

highlighting the importance of carefully drafted trust instruments and the application of state law in interpreting those instruments. It has implications for estate planning, trust administration, and tax compliance, as well as for determining how distributions from estates and trusts are taxed.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.