Barbara B. Hesse v. Commissioner, 26 T.C. 649 (1956)

The characterization of payments made pursuant to a divorce decree as either alimony (taxable to the recipient and deductible by the payor) or a property settlement (not taxable/deductible) depends on the substance of the agreement, not merely its label.

Summary

In Hesse v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether payments received by a divorced wife were taxable alimony or a non-taxable property settlement. The divorce decree stated the payments were "in lieu of additional community property and as part of the consideration for the division of the properties." However, examining the circumstances, the court found the payments were structured as alimony, based on the payor's income, with a 10-year-and-1-month period, cessation upon remarriage or death, and a provision for adjustment if federal tax laws changed. The court looked beyond the decree's terminology to the intent and substance of the agreement, holding that the payments constituted taxable alimony.

Facts

Barbara B. Hesse (the taxpayer) was divorced from her husband. The divorce decree mandated monthly payments to her, described in the decree as being "in lieu of additional community property and as part of the consideration for the division of the properties." The payments were based on her ex-husband's income, were scheduled to last for 10 years and 1 month, and would cease upon her remarriage or the death of either party. Additionally, the agreement specified that the payments were to be reduced to 25% of his after-tax income if the federal income tax laws changed such that he could no longer deduct the payments. The taxpayer contended that the payments were part of a property settlement, while the Commissioner argued they were taxable alimony.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Barbara Hesse's federal income tax for the years in question, asserting that the payments received were alimony and taxable to her. Hesse petitioned the Tax Court to challenge the Commissioner's determination, arguing the payments were part of a property settlement and not taxable alimony.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the monthly payments received by Barbara Hesse were "periodic payments" in discharge of a legal obligation imposed upon her ex-husband because of the marital relationship, and therefore includible in her gross income as alimony

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

under Section 22(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Holding

1. Yes, because the substance of the agreement and the circumstances surrounding the divorce indicated the payments were for support in the nature of alimony and not a settlement of property rights, despite the decree's wording.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized that the characterization of payments made pursuant to a divorce decree as either alimony or a property settlement is a question of fact, determined by the substance of the agreement rather than its label. The court examined the entire record, including the circumstances leading up to the divorce decree. The court noted that the payments were contingent on her husband's income, and the length of the payment period, cessation upon death or remarriage, and the income tax provision were all indicative of alimony. Furthermore, the court found that the payments were not related to an unequal division of community property. The court cited the following, "there was no principal amount which the husband was required to pay…The monthly payments here were keyed to the husband's income which the parties knew would fluctuate. And the use of a 10-year-and-l-month period was clearly intended to insure treatment of the payments as "periodic" within the meaning of section 22(k), even if the obligation might otherwise be thought to relate to a principal sum." The court determined the payments were intended for the support of the wife, thus representing alimony. The court also noted that the parties, in their separation agreement, referred to the payments as "alimony."

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of careful drafting and substance over form in divorce agreements with tax implications. Attorneys must consider the full context of the divorce, not just the labels used. Courts will look beyond the terminology of the agreement to determine its true nature. The structure of payments – their duration, contingencies, and relationship to the parties' financial circumstances – is critical. For example, if a client wants payments to be considered a property settlement to avoid taxation for the recipient, the agreement should avoid typical alimony characteristics. This means specifying a principal amount, avoiding contingencies like remarriage, and structuring the payments as a lump sum or a series of fixed installments over a short period. Conversely, if the goal is to have payments qualify as alimony, the agreement should include the hallmarks of alimony. This case also emphasizes the need to document the intent of the parties with clear and consistent language throughout all relevant documents.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 