Pierpont v. Commissioner, 35 T.C. 69 (1960) (Keen, J., dissenting)

Payments made by a corporation to the widow of a deceased employee, without legal obligation, pre-existing plan, or expectation of benefit to the corporation, and intended as recognition of the deceased's services, may be considered gifts rather than taxable income to the widow.

Summary

In this dissenting opinion, Judge Keen argues that salary continuation payments made to Mrs. Pierpont by her deceased husband's employer should be considered gifts, not taxable income. The dissent emphasizes that the payments were made to the widow, not the estate; there was no obligation to pay; the corporation derived no benefit; the widow performed no services; and the husband's services were fully compensated. Judge Keen distinguishes the Supreme Court's decision in *Commissioner v. Duberstein* and argues that prior Tax Court precedent supports treating such payments as gifts based on 'spontaneous benevolence'.

Facts

The Loewy Drug Co. made salary continuation payments to Mrs. Pierpont, the widow of a deceased employee, Mervin G. Pierpont. The company's board of directors resolution stated the payments were "in recognition of the services rendered by the late Mervin G. Pier-pont." The company was not legally obligated to make these payments, and they were not made pursuant to any prior contract, plan, policy, practice, or understanding. The Commissioner determined these payments constituted taxable income to Mrs. Pierpont.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the salary continuation payments to Mrs. Pierpont were taxable income. Mrs. Pierpont challenged this determination in Tax Court. This text presents Judge Keen's dissenting opinion, indicating the majority likely sided with the Commissioner, finding the payments to be taxable income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether salary continuation payments made by a corporation to the widow of a deceased employee, in recognition of the deceased's services but without any legal obligation or prior agreement, constitute a gift excludable from taxable income or taxable income to the widow?

Holding

1. (In Dissenting Opinion): Yes, the payments should be considered gifts because they were made to the widow, without obligation, for no benefit to the corporation,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

and in recognition of past services, aligning with factors previously recognized by the Tax Court as indicative of a gift.

Court's Reasoning

Judge Keen, dissenting, relies heavily on precedent cases such as *Florence S. Bunts*, *Estate of Arthur W. Hellstrom*, and *Bounds v. United States*, which held similar payments to be gifts. He emphasizes the five factors recapitulated in *Bunts* from *Hellstrom* that support gift treatment: "(1) the payments had been made to the wife of the deceased employee and not to his estate; (2) there was no obligation on the part of the corporation to pay any additional compensation to the deceased employee; (3) the corporation derived no benefit from the payment; (4) the wife of the deceased employee performed no services for the corporation; and (5) the services of her husband had been fully compensated." Judge Keen finds all these factors present in Mrs. Pierpont's case. He argues that the payments were made out of "spontaneous benevolence" and distinguishes *Commissioner v. Duberstein*, stating that the facts in *Duberstein* and related cases are significantly different and do not negate the established precedent for widow payments.

Practical Implications

This dissenting opinion highlights the pre-*Duberstein* legal landscape regarding payments to widows and the factors courts considered in determining whether such payments were gifts or income. It demonstrates the importance of factual analysis in tax cases, particularly regarding the intent behind payments made by corporations. While the dissent was not the majority opinion in this case, it reflects a significant line of reasoning that existed before *Duberstein* arguably shifted the focus towards a more fact-specific 'dominant reason' test for gifts. For legal professionals, this case underscores the historical context of the gift vs. income debate in the context of widow payments and the weight previously given to factors like lack of obligation and corporate benefit. Later cases, especially after *Duberstein*, would need to carefully consider the 'dominant reason' for the transfer, moving away from a purely factor-based analysis towards a more holistic examination of the facts and circumstances.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.