Flewellen v. Commissioner, 32 T.C. 317 (1959)

Donative assignments of in-oil payments and proceeds from already produced and marketed oil and gas interests to a tax-exempt charity are considered anticipatory assignments of future income, taxable to the donor when the income is realized by the charity.

Summary

The case concerned the tax treatment of charitable contributions made by Eugene T. Flewellen. Flewellen assigned portions of his oil and gas royalty interests to a charitable foundation. These assignments included both "in-oil payments" (rights to receive a specified sum from future oil production) and proceeds from gas and distillate that had already been produced and marketed. The court determined that these assignments constituted anticipatory assignments of income, meaning that Flewellen, not the charity, was liable for taxes on the income when the charity received it. The court distinguished this situation from assignments of property where the donor transfers the asset itself. The court followed the Supreme Court's ruling in *Commissioner v. P.G. Lake, Inc.*

Facts

Eugene Flewellen and his wife filed joint tax returns. In August 1954, Flewellen assigned a $3,000 in-oil payment to the Flewellen Charitable Foundation, payable from his interest in the Flewellen-Samedan lease. In May and October 1955, Flewellen made further assignments to the foundation: up to $5,000 from proceeds of gas and distillate already produced, and $2,000 from his overriding royalty interest in the Castleberry Unit. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Flewellens' income taxes for 1954 and 1955, arguing that the income was taxable to Flewellen.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the taxpayers' income taxes. The taxpayers appealed to the United States Tax Court to dispute the Commissioner's assessment. The Tax Court reviewed the facts and legal arguments.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the donative assignment of an in-oil payment to a tax-exempt charitable donee constituted an anticipatory assignment of future income, making the income taxable to the donor.

2. Whether the donative assignments to a tax-exempt charitable donee of sums due but not yet received by petitioner for his interest in gas and distillate that had been produced and marketed prior to the date of assignment also resulted in the anticipatory assignment of rights to future income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the assignment was of the right to receive future income from oil production, and not of the underlying property itself.

2. Yes, because the assignment of the right to receive proceeds from previously produced and marketed gas and distillate was also an anticipatory assignment of income.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied heavily on the Supreme Court's decision in *Commissioner v. P.G. Lake, Inc.*, which held that the assignment of carved-out oil payments results in the anticipatory assignment of future income. The court distinguished this from situations where the taxpayer assigns the property itself. The court noted that in this case, the assignment involved rights to income, either from future production or from production already completed. The court reasoned that these assignments were essentially a means of converting future income into present income, and therefore the income should be taxed to the donor. The court pointed out that "[t]he taxpayer has equally enjoyed the fruits of his labor or investment… whether he disposes of his right to collect it as the means of procuring them."

Practical Implications

This case has significant implications for those making charitable donations of oil and gas interests. It clarifies that the tax treatment of such donations depends on the nature of the interest assigned. Donors cannot avoid taxation simply by assigning the right to receive income to a charity. The ruling reinforces the anticipatory assignment of income doctrine. This case would influence how taxpayers and the IRS determine who is liable for taxes on income from similar assignments. It highlights the importance of distinguishing between assignments of property interests and assignments of the right to receive income. Legal practitioners must advise clients to consider the tax consequences carefully when structuring charitable contributions of oil and gas interests. This case is a crucial precedent for understanding the tax implications of donating mineral rights or similar income streams.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.