Estate of George W. Dichtel, Deceased, Rozanne Pera, Executrix, Petitioner, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 30 T.C. 1258 (1958)

Life insurance proceeds are includible in a decedent's gross estate if the decedent paid the premiums on the policy, even if the proceeds are payable to a third-party beneficiary.

Summary

The Estate of George W. Dichtel challenged an IRS determination regarding the inclusion of life insurance proceeds in the decedent's gross estate. The decedent, a partner in an electrical contracting business, had taken out life insurance policies to fund a buy-sell agreement with his partner. The policies named the partner as beneficiary. The court addressed two issues: (1) whether the life insurance proceeds paid to the partner were includible in the decedent's gross estate, and (2) whether a bequest to the decedent's daughter, a member of a religious order, was deductible as a charitable contribution. The court held that the life insurance proceeds were includible because the decedent paid the premiums, and that the bequest to the daughter was not deductible as a charitable contribution because it was a gift to an individual, not a religious organization.

Facts

George W. Dichtel and Joseph Dattilo were partners in an electrical contracting business. In 1930, they entered into a partnership agreement that included a provision allowing either partner to purchase the other's interest upon death. To fund this agreement, each partner insured his life, naming the other as beneficiary. Dichtel owned three life insurance policies with a total face value of $25,000, with Dattilo designated as the primary beneficiary. The policies granted the insured various rights, including the right to change the beneficiary. Dichtel's estate excluded the insurance proceeds payable to Dattilo from its estate tax return. Dichtel also bequeathed $1,000 to his daughter, who was a member of a religious order. The estate claimed this bequest as a charitable deduction.

Procedural History

The IRS determined a deficiency in the estate tax, arguing that the life insurance proceeds were includible in the gross estate and disallowing the charitable deduction for the bequest to the daughter. The estate contested the deficiency in the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the proceeds of the life insurance policies on the decedent's life, payable to his business partner, were includible in the decedent's gross estate under Section 811(g)(2) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether a bequest of $1,000 to the decedent's daughter, a member of a religious order, was deductible as a charitable contribution under Section 812(d) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the decedent paid the premiums on the life insurance policies.

2. No, because the bequest was made to an individual, not a qualifying charity.

Court's Reasoning

The court first addressed the life insurance proceeds. The court examined Section 811(g)(2)(A) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code, which stated life insurance proceeds are included in the gross estate if the policies were "purchased with premiums, or other consideration, paid directly or indirectly by the decedent." The court determined that because Dichtel paid the premiums on the policies, the proceeds paid to Dattilo were properly included in Dichtel's gross estate. The court reasoned that even if the partnership funds were used to pay the premiums, it could be considered an indirect payment by the decedent. The court emphasized that "the insurance in question was 'purchased with premiums * * * paid directly or indirectly by the decedent' within the meaning of section 811 (g) (2) (A)." Having found the premiums were paid by the decedent, the court did not consider whether the decedent retained incidents of ownership.

The second issue concerned the bequest to the daughter. Section 812(d) allowed deductions for transfers to religious organizations. The court noted that the will made a bequest directly to the daughter, an individual, not to her religious order. The court held that the bequest was not deductible, because the bequest was "made solely to an individual, which clearly does not constitute a deductible transfer to charity within the meaning of the statute."

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes the importance of understanding the specific requirements of the Internal Revenue Code regarding the inclusion of life insurance proceeds in a decedent's gross estate. It clarifies that premium payments made by the decedent, even indirectly, can trigger inclusion of the proceeds, even if they are paid to a third party. This has significant implications for estate planning when buy-sell agreements or other arrangements are funded with life insurance. To avoid estate tax implications, practitioners must consider whether the decedent retained any incidents of ownership, and who paid the premiums. The case also underscores that bequests to individuals, even if they are members of religious orders, are not necessarily considered charitable contributions unless they are made directly to a qualifying charity.

This case is a foundational one for understanding how life insurance is treated in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

estate tax planning and the limitations on charitable deductions. Attorneys drafting wills and trusts need to be very precise about the language used to make sure that the intent of the testator is carried out.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.