James F. D'Angelo v. Commissioner, 34 T.C. 705 (1960)

Life insurance premiums paid by a taxpayer on policies assigned as collateral for a personal debt are not deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses for the conservation of property held for the production of income under Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether a taxpayer could deduct life insurance premiums paid by a trustee on policies covering the taxpayer's life. The policies were assigned as collateral to secure bonds on which the taxpayer was the obligor. The court held that the premiums were not deductible as nonbusiness expenses under Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court reasoned that the primary purpose of the premiums was to provide collateral for a personal debt, not to conserve property held for the production of income. The court also addressed the issue of additions to tax for failure to file declarations of estimated tax.

Facts

James F. D'Angelo, the taxpayer, was indebted to various individuals and transferred his interest in the Rose M. Taylor Trust to the First National Bank of Philadelphia, as trustee, to secure bonds issued to his creditors. The bond indenture required the trustee to apply income from the trust, in part, to pay premiums on life insurance policies covering D'Angelo. These policies, procured by D'Angelo, were assigned to the trustee as collateral. D'Angelo included his share of the trust income in his gross income and deducted the premium payments made by the trustee. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed these deductions.

Procedural History

The Commissioner disallowed the taxpayer's deductions for life insurance premiums paid by the trustee. D'Angelo contested the disallowance in the Tax Court. The Tax Court found for the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to deduct premiums paid on life insurance policies covering his life, where the policies were procured by him and assigned as collateral to secure bonds on which he was the obligor.

2. Whether the taxpayer is liable for additions to tax as determined by the Commissioner.

Holding

1. No, because the primary purpose of the insurance premiums was to provide

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

collateral for a personal debt rather than to conserve property held for the production of income.

2. Yes, the taxpayer was liable for additions to tax for failure to file declarations of estimated tax under Section 294(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. No, he was not liable under section 294(d)(2).

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which allowed deductions for ordinary and necessary expenses for the conservation of property held for the production of income. The court distinguished the premiums paid as primarily related to a personal obligation to provide collateral rather than a business expense. The court stated, "The procurement of the policies and the payment of the premiums was therefore a means of providing collateral for a personal obligation owed by the petitioner." The court determined that the potential effect on the Rose M. Taylor Trust was merely incidental to the provision of collateral. The court cited other cases to support their holding. The court also considered the Commissioner's determination of additions to tax and sustained the additions for failure to file declarations of estimated tax. Regarding the additions to tax under section 294(d)(2), the court denied their imposition in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Commissioner v. Acker*.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the distinction between personal and business expenses for tax purposes, specifically the non-deductibility of life insurance premiums when used as collateral for a personal debt. This case informs the analysis of similar situations involving the deductibility of expenses related to life insurance policies and personal obligations. The court's focus on the primary purpose of the premiums paid provides a framework for determining whether an expense is related to the production of income or a personal obligation. It demonstrates that the deductibility of expenses hinges on the character of the expense, not simply its potential impact on an asset. The case reinforces the importance of correctly classifying expenses on tax returns. It also influenced the application of additions to tax for failure to file estimated tax. Later cases would continue to apply this precedent.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.