Estate of Littick v. Commissioner, 31 T.C. 181 (1958)

When a shareholder's estate is bound by a valid, arm's-length buy-sell agreement, the agreed-upon price, not fair market value, controls the valuation of the stock for estate tax purposes, even if the decedent's health was poor when the agreement was made.

Summary

The case concerns the valuation of shares of stock in the Zanesville Publishing Company for federal estate tax purposes. The decedent, Orville B. Littick, entered into a buy-sell agreement with his brothers and the company. The agreement stipulated that upon his death, his shares would be purchased for $200,000, although the fair market value was stipulated to be approximately $257,910.57. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued for the higher fair market value. The Tax Court held that the buy-sell agreement, being a valid agreement, was binding for valuation purposes, and the agreed-upon price of $200,000 was the correct value for estate tax calculation, despite the decedent's poor health at the time of the agreement's execution.

Facts

Orville B. Littick, along with his brothers Clay and Arthur, and his son William, entered into a stock purchase agreement with The Zanesville Publishing Company. The agreement stated that upon the death of any of the shareholders, the company would purchase the decedent's shares for $200,000. The agreement included restrictions on the transfer of shares during the shareholders' lifetimes. At the time of the agreement, Orville was suffering from a terminal illness. Upon Orville's death, the Commissioner determined the fair market value of the stock to be $257,910.57, which was the figure used to assess the estate tax, instead of the $200,000 figure outlined in the agreement.

Procedural History

The executors of the Estate of Orville B. Littick filed a petition in the Tax Court, disputing the Commissioner's valuation of the stock. The Tax Court reviewed the agreement and the circumstances surrounding its creation and determined that the agreement's valuation should be used for estate tax purposes.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the buy-sell agreement between the decedent, his brothers, his son, and the company controlled the value of the stock for estate tax purposes.

Holding

1. Yes, because the agreement set a price that was binding on the estate, despite the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

higher fair market value of the shares. The $200,000 price was the correct valuation for estate tax purposes.

Court’s Reasoning

The court recognized that restrictive agreements can be effective for estate tax purposes. The Commissioner argued that the agreement was part of a testamentary plan, not at arm’s length, because the decedent was ill when the agreement was signed. The court stated that because the $200,000 figure was fairly arrived at by arm’s-length negotiation, and no tax avoidance scheme was involved, the agreement was valid. The court found that the buy-sell agreement was binding and enforceable. The court reasoned that the agreement provided a mechanism for the orderly transfer of ownership and the court emphasized the agreement’s binding nature. Even though the decedent was ill, his brothers could have predeceased him. The agreement was therefore enforceable.

Practical Implications

This case is critical for establishing the importance of well-drafted buy-sell agreements in estate planning. It highlights the power of an agreement to fix the value of closely held stock for estate tax purposes, thereby potentially avoiding disputes with the IRS and making estate planning more predictable. The case underscores that when a shareholder enters into a valid, arm’s-length buy-sell agreement, the estate is bound by the agreement’s terms, even if the agreed-upon price differs from the stock’s fair market value. This principle is particularly relevant in family businesses or other situations where controlling ownership is critical. Later cases consistently cite this precedent, validating and encouraging the use of properly structured buy-sell agreements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.