29 T.C. 428 (1957)

A gift in trust for the benefit of a minor is considered a "future interest" for gift tax purposes if the beneficiary's access to the funds is contingent upon a future event, such as need, or the discretion of the trustee or trustor.

Summary

In 1952, Dr. George M. Street created six irrevocable trusts for his grandchildren, funding them with securities. Each trust could be used for the grandchild's support, comfort, and education, with payments made to the parents upon Dr. Street's request, or at the trustee's discretion. The IRS disallowed the $3,000 annual exclusion for each gift, arguing the gifts were "future interests" under the tax code. The Tax Court agreed, holding that the beneficiaries' interests in both the corpus and income were future interests because access to the funds was contingent on either the beneficiary's need or the discretion of the trustor or trustee. The court distinguished this from cases where beneficiaries or their guardians had the power to immediately access the funds.

Facts

Dr. George M. Street created six identical irrevocable trusts on March 25, 1952, for the benefit of his six minor grandchildren. Each trust was funded with marketable securities. The trust indentures stated that the income or principal could be used for each beneficiary's support, comfort, and education, with payments to the parents upon Dr. Street's written request, or at the trustee's discretion if Dr. Street was deceased. One half of the remaining trust fund would be paid to the beneficiary at age 25, and the balance at age 30. Dr. Street claimed six $3,000 exclusions on his 1952 gift tax return, which the Commissioner disallowed, asserting the gifts were future interests.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a gift tax deficiency against Dr. Street, disallowing the claimed exclusions. The Tax Court heard the case to determine if the gifts in trust qualified for the annual exclusion, or were considered future interests, subject to immediate taxation.

Issue(s)

Whether the gifts in trust for the benefit of Dr. Street's grandchildren were gifts of "future interests" within the meaning of Section 1003(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939?

Holding

Yes, because the interests of the grandchildren in both the corpus and income of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

trusts were contingent on future events and not immediately available to the beneficiaries, they constituted “future interests.”

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied on the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Fondren v. Commissioner* and *Commissioner v. Disston*. These cases established that if a beneficiary’s access to trust funds is contingent on a future event, it is considered a future interest. The court emphasized that the beneficiaries in Street’s trusts did not have an immediate right to the income or corpus. Payments were conditioned on the beneficiary’s need and the discretion of either Dr. Street or the trustee. The court stated, “The beneficiaries were not given the right to immediate present enjoyment of any ascertainable portion of the trust income… Rather, their rights were conditioned… upon the happening of the contingency of their need, and also upon the discretion of the trustor.” The court distinguished the case from others where beneficiaries or their representatives had the power to immediately access the funds.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the distinction between present and future interests in gift tax law, particularly in the context of trusts for minors. Attorneys should carefully analyze the terms of any trust to determine whether a gift constitutes a present or future interest. Specifically, if the beneficiary’s access to funds is conditional (e.g., subject to the trustee’s discretion or a future need), the gift will likely be considered a future interest, and not eligible for the annual exclusion. This case remains relevant in estate planning and gift tax strategies, and advisors must consider the conditions that trigger a present interest to achieve desired tax outcomes. Subsequent cases have consistently cited this case in the interpretation of “future interest” in trust law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.