30 T.C. 798 (1958)

A taxpayer’s bona fide transfer of a life estate in a trust, for valuable consideration, shifts the tax liability for the trust income from the transferor to the transferee, even if the transfer is to a family member.

Summary

In Evans v. Commissioner, the U.S. Tax Court addressed whether a taxpayer, Gladys Cheesman Evans, was still liable for income tax on dividends paid to a trust after she had transferred her life interest in the trust to her husband. The court held that because Evans had transferred her entire interest in the trust for valuable consideration to her husband, the income generated by the trust was not taxable to her. The court found the transaction valid for tax purposes, despite the familial relationship, because the transfer was intended to be a sale and was not a sham. This case highlights the importance of substance over form in tax law and that a complete transfer of a property right can shift tax obligations.

Facts

Gladys Cheesman Evans and her mother created a trust in 1920, transferring stock of a real estate corporation. Evans’s husband was the trustee. After her mother’s death, Evans was the equitable life tenant. Following Supreme Court decisions in 1950 regarding estate tax implications for trusts, Evans sought to dispose of her interests in the trust. She and her advisors decided on a sale to her husband, who agreed to make annual payments to her during her life in exchange for the life estate and any reversionary interest. A formal deed was executed on December 1, 1950. Subsequently, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that dividends paid to the trust constituted taxable income to Evans, despite the transfer. Evans received payments from her husband consistent with the agreement and the payments were credited against her unrecovered cost basis in the trust.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined tax deficiencies against Evans for the years 1950-1954. The case was brought before the U.S. Tax Court to challenge the Commissioner’s inclusion of the trust dividends in Evans’s taxable income, despite the transfer of her life interest. The Tax Court found in favor of the taxpayer, Evans, and the Commissioner did not appeal.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of Evans’s life interest in the trust to her husband was a valid transfer for tax purposes.

2. Whether the income from the trust was taxable to Evans after she had sold her life interest to her husband.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, the transfer was a valid transfer for tax purposes because the deed transferred complete ownership to her husband without qualification or condition.

2. No, the income from the trust was not taxable to Evans after the transfer of her life interest.

Court's Reasoning

The court's reasoning centered on whether the transaction between Evans and her husband was a genuine transfer of ownership or a mere attempt to avoid taxes. The court scrutinized the familial relationship, but found that the sale had substance. The court acknowledged the Commissioner's argument about the lack of an arm's length transaction and family motives. However, the court found that Evans intended to sell her interest and her husband intended to buy it. The court looked at the intent of the parties and the formal execution of the deed to support its finding. The court emphasized that the transfer was a complete alienation of Evans's rights and interests, in exchange for valuable consideration, thereby shifting the tax incidence.

The court stated: "In our opinion, petitioner's decision to make the transfer here in question was caused by her desire to escape the impact of *Commissioner v. Estate of Church* and *Estate of Spiegel v. Commissioner*, and at the same time realize money by disposing of her interests under the trust."

The court found that the inadequacy of consideration was not relevant because no suit for equity was brought. It looked to the intent of the parties to determine the substance of the transaction. The court acknowledged the Commissioner's dissatisfaction but refused to ignore a transaction that validly transferred ownership.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance in the tax treatment of property transfers within families. It clarifies that transfers of interests in property, even within family units, will be respected for tax purposes if they are genuine transfers of ownership for valuable consideration, and not shams. This case is authority for the principle that, in tax matters, the substance of a transaction prevails over its form. It suggests that taxpayers can restructure ownership to shift tax liabilities, provided that the transfers are complete and reflect economic reality. This case is relevant for estate planning and income tax strategies.

Later cases, when interpreting this ruling, would focus on the bona fides of the transfer, meaning that the parties involved truly intend for a sale, exchange, or gift to occur. When dealing with family members, tax courts will scrutinize such transactions more closely. If the transfer is intended, then the tax consequences will

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

follow the transfer of the property interest.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.