Estate of Charles B. Wolf, Charles S. Wolf, Frances G. Wolf, Executors, Petitioner, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 29 T.C. 441 (1957)

Benefits from a profit-sharing trust and retirement agreements with enforceable vested rights are includible in a decedent's gross estate, either as property the decedent had an interest in at the time of death or because the decedent possessed a general power of appointment.

Summary

In *Estate of Wolf v. Commissioner*, the U.S. Tax Court addressed several estate tax issues, primarily focusing on whether certain benefits payable to the decedent's wife and family were includible in the gross estate. The court held that the value of payments from profit-sharing trusts and retirement agreements, where the decedent possessed enforceable vested rights, was includible in the gross estate. The court also addressed the inclusion of life insurance proceeds and the deductibility of claims against the estate based on demand notes, determining that the statute of limitations impacted the deductibility of some of the claims.

Facts

Charles B. Wolf, the decedent, was an employee and officer of Superior Paper Products Company. Superior established a profit-sharing trust and a retirement and pension trust, naming Wolf's wife as the beneficiary. Wolf also had similar agreements with the Wm. D. Smith Trucking Co. Wolf had assigned a life insurance policy to his wife. He also signed demand notes for money received from his wife and children, which they received from dividend distributions from their companies. Wolf died in 1951. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Wolf's estate tax, leading to the litigation over the inclusion of certain assets and the deductibility of certain claims.

Procedural History

The case was heard in the United States Tax Court. The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the estate tax. The executors of Wolf's estate contested this determination. The Tax Court ruled on the issues, primarily concerning whether certain assets were includible in the gross estate and the deductibility of claims against the estate.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the present value of amounts payable under a profit-sharing trust and certain retirement agreements is includible in the decedent's gross estate under any section of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939?

2. Whether the face amount of a life insurance policy on the life of decedent naming

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

his wife beneficiary is includible in his gross estate under Section 811(g)(2), I.R.C. 1939?

3. Did the decedent's wife and children have claims deductible from his gross estate under Section 812(b), I.R.C. 1939?

Holding

1. Yes, because the decedent had enforceable vested rights at the time of his death, and these rights are includible either under the general provisions of Section 811(a) or as a power of appointment under Section 811(f)(2).

2. Yes, because the petitioners failed to prove that the decedent did not pay the insurance premiums, directly or indirectly.

3. Partially, as claims were deductible if not barred by the statute of limitations. Claims against the estate based on notes held by the wife and older children were barred by the statute of limitations and therefore not deductible, whereas those of the two younger children were not barred and were deductible.

Court's Reasoning

The court's reasoning centered on the interpretation of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, specifically Section 811 (concerning the gross estate) and Section 812 (concerning deductions). Regarding the profit-sharing and retirement agreements, the court found that the decedent had enforceable vested rights. The court emphasized that the decedent's death triggered the passage of these rights to the beneficiary. Therefore, the value of these rights was includible in the gross estate under either Section 811(a), as an interest in property held at the time of death, or Section 811(f)(2), as the exercise of a general power of appointment. The court distinguished this case from cases where the employer had unfettered control over the pension plan. The court found that, since the decedent could designate or change beneficiaries, the rights constituted a general power of appointment.

On the issue of the life insurance policy, the court found that the petitioners failed to meet their burden of proof to show that the decedent did not pay the premiums indirectly, and thus upheld the inclusion of the policy proceeds in the gross estate. The court also addressed the deductibility of the claims based on demand notes. The court applied Pennsylvania law to determine if the claims were enforceable and if the statute of limitations had run. The court found that, under Pennsylvania law, the claims of the wife and the two older children were time-barred because they had been past due for more than six years at the time of decedent's death, and therefore not deductible, while those of the younger children were not.

Practical Implications

This case is a critical precedent for estate planning and taxation of employee

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

benefits. It highlights the importance of vesting and control in determining the includibility of such benefits in the gross estate. The case suggests that if an employee has vested rights in a retirement plan, which will pass to a designated beneficiary at death, the value of those rights will likely be included in the gross estate. It also emphasizes that the burden of proof lies with the estate to demonstrate that assets should not be included. Attorneys must carefully examine the terms of retirement plans and insurance policies when advising clients on estate planning to determine how these assets will be treated for estate tax purposes. Also, legal practitioners should ensure the timely assertion of claims against an estate, particularly when the statute of limitations is at issue.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.