Estate of Bernard E. Denzer, Alan R. Denzer, Executor, Petitioner, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 29 T.C. 237 (1957)

When a settlor of a trust has certain powers to modify and appoint beneficiaries, but ultimately relinquishes those powers in a settlement agreement to preserve the trust, the trust assets aren’t necessarily included in the settlor’s gross estate if there’s no effective transfer where the settlor retained a life interest.

Summary

The Estate of Bernard E. Denzer challenged the Commissioner's assessment of estate tax, arguing that a trust's assets should not be included in the gross estate. Denzer's father initially set up a trust, granting Denzer a life income with the power to modify and name beneficiaries, subject to trustee consent. Denzer attempted to revoke the trust, but the trustee's consent was conditional. A settlement agreement was reached where Denzer received half the trust corpus and relinquished his power to amend the trust or make testamentary dispositions, but still retained the life income of the remaining trust corpus. The Tax Court ruled that no taxable transfer occurred under I.R.C. §811 (c)(1)(B), as Denzer's actions didn't create a new trust with a retained life estate.

Facts

T. Richard Denzer established a trust in 1921, with the National City Bank of New York as trustee, reserving income for his life, then to his wife, and then to his son, Bernard E. Denzer (decedent). The trust instrument allowed the settlor, and later Bernard, to modify the trust with the trustee's consent. In 1930, the settlor modified the trust to give Bernard the income for life and the power to appoint the principal in his will. The settlor died in 1938. In 1940, Bernard attempted to revoke the trust, but the trustee's consent was conditional, leading to a Supreme Court action. A settlement agreement was reached. Bernard was to receive half of the trust corpus and relinquished his powers to amend and appoint beneficiaries of the remaining half, but still had the life income. Bernard died in 1953. The Commissioner sought to include the value of the trust property in Bernard's gross estate. 

Procedural History

After Bernard Denzer's death, the executor did not include any of the trust property in the estate tax return. The Commissioner determined a deficiency, which the estate contested. The case was heard by the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the trust was effectively revoked in 1940, such that the execution of subsequent instruments relating to the remaining half of the trust constituted a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

"transfer" by the decedent subject to estate tax under IRC § 811(c)(1)(B)?

2. Whether the settlement agreement and the subsequent instruments executed by the decedent created a new trust, with the decedent as grantor, making the trust property includible in the gross estate?

Holding

1. No, because the trustee's consent to the revocation was conditional and not unqualified, the trust was not revoked and there was no taxable event. The trustee's consent letter of March 29, 1940, wasn't sufficient as it depended on a court determination which never happened.

2. No, because the settlement agreement did not create a new trust; the old trust continued with the same beneficial interests as would result from an unexercised power. The court viewed the agreement as preserving the original trust, not creating a new one.

Court's Reasoning

The court first addressed the attempted revocation, noting the importance of the trustee's consent. The court found the consent insufficient because it was conditional. The court stated, "We do not construe the trustee's letter of March 29, 1940, as the necessary trustee's consent." The court stated that the actions of the trustee and decedent did not terminate the trust. The court then examined if the settlement agreement created a new trust, arguing that the compromise agreement's main purpose was not to destroy the trust, but rather to preserve it. The court held the decedent merely relinquished his power to appoint beneficiaries, but the remainder beneficiaries were the same as they would have been if the power had never been exercised. The court held the value of the corpus of the trust was not includible in the decedent's estate.

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes that a trust beneficiary's power to modify a trust can have tax implications. Attorneys should carefully examine the exact terms of a trust agreement and the actions of the beneficiaries and trustees when the government challenges a trust for tax liability. The case suggests that when a beneficiary relinquishes powers to settle litigation without creating new beneficial interests or reserving a life estate, the assets may not be includible in the gross estate. The court considered the substance of the transaction rather than the form. The ruling supports the idea that preserving an existing trust, rather than creating a new one, is less likely to trigger adverse estate tax consequences. This decision is useful when analyzing transactions involving settlements that modify existing trusts to determine if a taxable transfer has taken place. It reinforces the importance of fully understanding the actions of beneficiaries and trustees to determine if there was an

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

actual change in the trust and if there was a retained life interest or other powers that trigger inclusion in the gross estate.</p>

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 