Estate of John A. Maycann, Sr., Deceased, Berenice W. Maycann and Hamilton National Bank of Chattanooga, Executors, and Berenice W. Maycann, Surviving Wife, Petitioners, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 29 T.C. 81 (1957)

Whether a corporate payment to a deceased employee's widow is a gift, and thus excludable from gross income, depends on the intent of the payor, not the nature of the payment.

Summary

The Estate of John A. Maycann, Sr. challenged the Commissioner's determination that a $5,000 payment from Hibbler-Barnes Company to the decedent's widow, Berenice Maycann, constituted taxable income. The Tax Court considered whether the payment was a dividend, compensation for past services, or a gift. The court held that the payment was a gift, based on the intent of the corporate board of directors, and therefore excludable from Berenice's gross income. The court emphasized that the corporation had no obligation to make the payment and that the board's intent was to recognize the decedent's service through a gift to his widow, regardless of prior practices regarding compensation.

Facts

John A. Maycann, Sr. was the president and treasurer of Hibbler-Barnes Company for 42 years until his death in 1950. The corporation paid him a salary and bonus. Following his death, the board of directors, at a special meeting, passed a resolution to pay Maycann's widow, Berenice Maycann, $7,400 and subsequent monthly payments. The corporation's attorney sought tax counsel advice prior to this payment, who stated the payment would not be taxable. The corporation deducted the payment as a general expense on its tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that $5,000 of the payment was taxable to the widow, arguing it was either a dividend or additional compensation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a deficiency notice to the Estate of John A. Maycann, Sr., and Berenice W. Maycann, challenging the tax treatment of the $5,000 payment to the widow. The petitioners challenged this determination in the U.S. Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $5,000 payment received by Berenice W. Maycann from Hibbler-Barnes Company constituted a nontaxable gift or taxable income, either as a dividend or additional compensation for the decedent's past services.

2. Whether the Commissioner erred in disallowing a deduction for medical expenses

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to the extent of 5% of the $5,000 payment.

Holding

1. Yes, the $5,000 payment was a gift and therefore not taxable income.

2. Yes, the Commissioner erred in disallowing the medical expense deduction as it was based on the erroneous determination that the $5,000 payment was taxable income.

Court’s Reasoning

The Court considered whether the payment was a dividend, compensation, or a gift. It noted that the intention of the payor, the corporation, was the controlling factor. The Court emphasized the testimony of the directors, who stated they intended to make a gift to the widow in recognition of her husband’s service. The court found that the corporation had no obligation to make any payment to Berenice, that she performed no services in return, and that no dividend was contemplated. The court relied on cases like *Bogardus v. Commissioner*, which stated that a gift is still a gift even if it is based on gratitude. The Court also pointed out that the payment was not related to a dividend distribution because the corporate board did not intend for it to be a dividend, and that the payment was not additional compensation because the decedent had already been fully compensated for his work.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of documenting the intent of a corporation when making payments to employees or their survivors. To ensure a payment qualifies as a gift, the corporation should:

- Clearly articulate the intent to make a gift in the board resolution.
- Avoid characterizing the payment as salary or compensation.
- Ensure that the recipient provided no services in exchange for the payment.
- Consider the overall circumstances, such as the financial health of the corporation and the relationship between the board members and the deceased.

This case is frequently cited for its discussion of the gift versus income distinction in the context of corporate payments. It highlights the need to differentiate between payments made out of a sense of detached generosity from those with a business purpose.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.