Willits v. Commissioner, 36 T. C. 1078 (1961)

Income is constructively received when it is made available to the taxpayer without substantial limitation or restriction, even if not actually received.

Summary

In Willits v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled on when trustee commissions should be taxed under the constructive receipt doctrine. The case involved Oliver G. Willits, who attempted to defer income from trust commissions. The court held that commissions from the Strawbridge Trust, paid in 1960, were taxable that year because they were available to Willits without restriction. In contrast, commissions from the Dorrance Trusts, subject to a court order for deferred payment, were not taxable in 1961. The decision clarifies the distinction between actual and constructive receipt of income for tax purposes.

Facts

Oliver G. Willits was a trustee for several trusts, including the Strawbridge Trust and four Dorrance Trusts. In 1960, the Strawbridge Trust terminated and paid out terminal corpus commissions totaling $920,000, with Willits's share being $178,888. 78. Willits attempted to defer this income over five years through an agreement with his co-trustees. In 1961, following the death of a co-trustee of the Dorrance Trusts, a court ordered that Willits's commissions be paid in four annual installments starting in 1962.

Procedural History

Willits filed his tax returns for 1960 and 1961 without including the commissions in question. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue asserted deficiencies, leading to a dispute over the timing of income recognition. The case was heard by the Tax Court, which had to determine whether Willits constructively received the commissions in the years they were paid or allocated.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $178,888. 78 in terminal corpus commissions from the Strawbridge Trust, allocated and paid in 1960, were constructively received by Willits in that year.
2. Whether the corpus commissions from the Dorrance Trusts, subject to a court order for deferred payment, were constructively received by Willits in 1961.

Holding

1. Yes, because the commissions were available to Willits without substantial limitation or restriction in 1960, despite his attempt to defer them through a private agreement with his co-trustees.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the court order effectively prevented Willits from receiving the commissions in 1961, and thus they were not constructively received in that year.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the constructive receipt doctrine, which states that income is taxable when it is made available to the taxpayer without substantial limitation or restriction. For the Strawbridge Trust commissions, the court found that Willits’s attempt to defer income was a sham arrangement with accommodating co-trustees, not a bona fide contract with the trust itself. The court emphasized that the trust had paid the commissions in 1960, and Willits had no right to defer them. In contrast, the Dorrance Trust commissions were subject to a court order that deferred payment until after 1961, which the court treated as equivalent to a bona fide contract for deferred payment. The court distinguished between these situations by noting that the Dorrance Trust commissions were not available to Willits in 1961, as per the court’s decree. The court cited previous cases like Commissioner v. Oates to support its conclusion that a court order can effectively defer income recognition.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how taxpayers and legal practitioners should approach the timing of income recognition under the constructive receipt doctrine. It underscores that attempts to defer income through private arrangements may be disregarded if they lack a bona fide basis. Taxpayers should be cautious about entering into agreements that appear to be shams designed to manipulate tax liabilities. For trusts and estates, the case highlights the importance of court orders in determining when income is taxable. Practitioners must advise clients on the potential tax consequences of court-ordered payment schedules. The ruling may affect how trusts structure payments to trustees and how trustees report income, ensuring that they align with legal and tax obligations. Subsequent cases have referenced Willits to clarify the application of the constructive receipt doctrine, particularly in contexts involving trusts and estates.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.