Estate of Inez G. Coleman, Deceased, D. C. Coleman, Jr. , Executor, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 52 T. C. 921 (1969)

Only the premiums paid in contemplation of death are includable in the gross estate, not the proportionate value of the insurance proceeds.

Summary

In Estate of Coleman v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether life insurance proceeds should be included in the decedent's estate based on the premiums she paid in contemplation of death. The decedent's children owned the policy, but she paid all premiums, some of which were in contemplation of death. The court held that only the premiums paid within three years of death and in contemplation of death should be included in the estate, rejecting the Commissioner's argument for including a proportionate part of the proceeds. Additionally, the court ruled that a security deposit received by the decedent under a long-term lease was not deductible as a claim against the estate due to its contingent nature.

Facts

Inez G. Coleman died on July 9, 1964. Her three children purchased a life insurance policy on her life on June 23, 1961, and were the beneficiaries. Coleman paid all premiums totaling $4,821, with $1,686. 50 paid within three years of her death and in contemplation of death. Upon her death, the children received $25,905. 94 in proceeds. Additionally, Coleman received a $36,000 security deposit under a 99-year lease in 1958, which was returnable only if the lessee complied with all lease terms until the lease's expiration in 2057.

Procedural History

The Commissioner asserted a deficiency of $20,334. 75 in estate tax against the estate. The estate filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court, contesting the inclusion of a proportionate part of the life insurance proceeds in the gross estate and seeking a deduction for the security deposit. The case was heard by the Tax Court, which ruled in favor of the estate on the insurance issue and in favor of the Commissioner on the security deposit issue.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the amount to be included in the decedent's gross estate under section 2035 should be a prorata portion of the insurance proceeds or the amount of premiums paid in contemplation of death.
2. Whether the potential obligation to refund a $36,000 security deposit under a lease constitutes a deductible claim under section 2053.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the decedent did not transfer an interest in the policy itself; only the premiums paid in contemplation of death are includable in the gross estate.
2. No, because the obligation to refund the deposit was contingent upon the lessee's performance over the remaining lease term, and thus not a deductible claim.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that section 2035 applies to transfers of property interests in contemplation of death. Here, the decedent did not transfer the policy or its proceeds; she only paid the premiums, which did not constitute a transfer of the policy's economic benefits. The court distinguished this from cases where a policy was transferred or where the decedent retained incidents of ownership. The court also noted that the legislative history of section 2042, which abolished the premium payment test for including life insurance proceeds, supported a narrow interpretation of section 2035. Regarding the security deposit, the court found it was too contingent to be deductible, as the lessee's performance over the remaining 93. 5 years of the lease was uncertain. The dissenting opinions argued that the decedent's premium payments should be valued at the insurance protection they purchased, not just the cash paid.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for life insurance policies owned by third parties, only premiums paid in contemplation of death are includable in the gross estate under section 2035, not a proportionate share of the proceeds. This impacts estate planning by limiting the tax exposure from such arrangements. Practitioners should advise clients to structure life insurance ownership carefully to minimize estate tax liability. The ruling also reinforces the principle that contingent liabilities, like security deposits with long-term conditions, are not deductible under section 2053. This decision has been cited in subsequent cases dealing with the valuation of transfers in contemplation of death and the deductibility of contingent claims.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.