Sneed v. Commissioner, 34 T.C. 477 (1960)

The court determined that a beneficiary of a trust, whose income was derived from oil royalties and bonuses directed to be accumulated for remaindermen, was not entitled to a depletion deduction on the distributions received because the income was not distributable to the beneficiary under the terms of the trust.

Summary

Brad Love Sneed, the petitioner, received annual payments from a testamentary trust created by her deceased husband's will. The trust's income came from ranching and cattle operations, as well as oil royalties and bonuses, the income of which the will directed to be accumulated. Sneed claimed a depletion deduction on the distributions she received, arguing that she was entitled to an allocable portion of the depletion allowance. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner, ruling that Sneed was not entitled to the deduction because the trust instrument dictated that the oil royalties and bonuses should be retained as corpus and not distributed to her. The court emphasized the will's specific instructions, which it interpreted as creating an investment trust where only the income from investments, not the proceeds themselves, were distributable. Because Sneed received income solely from the trust's cattle operations, and because royalties were to be accumulated, she was not eligible for the depletion deduction.

Facts

J.T. Sneed Jr. (decedent) executed a will directing his executors to convert personal property into cash or bonds, and to hold, manage, invest, and reinvest all proceeds from royalties, rentals, and leases, as well as the income from investments. The net income was to be paid to his daughter, Elizabeth Sneed Pool. A codicil to the will provided that his wife, Brad Love Sneed (petitioner), should receive $15,000 annually. The executors paid Sneed $15,000 annually, paid out of the trust's distributable income, primarily from a cattle business. The trust also received income from oil royalties and bonuses, which, according to the trustees' interpretation of the will, were treated as corpus and reinvested. Sneed reported the $15,000 received as income but claimed a percentage depletion deduction, which the Commissioner disallowed.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Sneed's income tax for 1953, 1954, and 1955, disallowing the depletion deduction. Sneed contested these adjustments in the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether the petitioner is entitled to deductions for depletion on any part of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

distributions made to her from the trust estate during the taxable years involved?

Holding

No, because the will directed that the royalties and bonus income be retained as corpus and invested for the benefit of remaindermen, and the payments to petitioner were made out of the income from the trust's cattle business, not the oil and gas income.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on the specific language of the will to determine the testator's intent. The will directed that all money from royalties, rentals, and leases be held, managed, invested, and reinvested, with only the net income to be distributed. The court interpreted this as creating an investment trust where the proceeds from oil and gas activities became corpus and only the income generated from the corpus was distributable. The court cited *Fleming v. Commissioner*, which construed the term "allocable" in the 1939 Code to mean "distributable." Because the income from oil and gas royalties was not, under the terms of the will, distributable to Sneed, she was not entitled to the depletion deduction. The court also referenced Texas law, which prioritizes the testator's intent when interpreting a will and considered the circumstances surrounding the will's execution. The trustees' interpretation of the will to accumulate oil and gas income as corpus was deemed correct.

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes the critical importance of precisely drafted trust instruments when determining the allocation of tax deductions. It underscores that beneficiaries cannot claim depletion deductions on income that, according to the trust's terms, is designated as corpus and not distributable to them. This decision influences how similar cases should be analyzed by focusing on the intention of the testator, and if oil and gas income is designated as corpus, no deduction is allowable. It highlights the necessity for trustees to correctly classify income based on trust provisions. It also informs estate planning, particularly when mineral interests are involved. If the testator intends for beneficiaries to receive the benefit of depletion deductions, the trust instrument must clearly state that the income subject to depletion is distributable. This case continues to be cited in tax disputes over the allocation of depletion deductions and income classification in trusts.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.