Ostrov v. Commissioner, 53 T. C. 361 (1969)

Life insurance premiums paid by a former spouse on a policy owned by the other spouse are not taxable income if they do not confer an economic benefit.

Summary

In Ostrov v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that life insurance premiums paid by Harold Ostrov on a policy owned by his former wife, Rena, were not includable in her taxable income. The court found that Rena did not receive an economic benefit from the premiums since the policy's cash surrender value was always less than the outstanding loan amount used to pay the premiums. This case established that such payments do not constitute taxable income when they are part of a property settlement and do not provide a direct benefit to the policy owner.

Facts

Rena Ostrov obtained a life insurance policy on her then-husband Nathaniel Soifer's life before their divorce. Post-divorce, Soifer agreed to pay the premiums through loans secured by the policy, ensuring the loans always exceeded the policy's cash surrender value. The divorce agreement also stipulated that Soifer would bequeath Rena $150,000, reduced by any insurance proceeds she received. The IRS argued these premium payments should be taxable income to Rena.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in Rena Ostrov's income tax for 1964 and 1965 due to the non-inclusion of the premium payments as income. Rena and her new husband, Harold Ostrov, petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for relief, arguing the payments were not taxable income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether life insurance premiums paid by a former spouse on a policy owned by the other spouse are taxable income to the owner when the policy's cash surrender value is always less than the outstanding loan amount used to pay the premiums?

Holding

1. No, because the premiums did not confer an economic benefit to Rena Ostrov and were part of a property settlement, not alimony.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that for premiums to be taxable, they must provide an economic benefit to the recipient. In this case, the premiums were financed through loans against the policy, ensuring the cash surrender value was always less than the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

loan amount. Judge Withey noted, “the policy could not be used by her as collateral for borrowing,” and any insurance proceeds would reduce the bequest amount from Soifer’s estate, negating any economic benefit to Rena. The court distinguished this case from others like Carmichael and Stewart, where an economic benefit was found, emphasizing that here, the premiums only reduced Soifer’s estate liability. The court relied on cases like Smith and Weil, where similar arrangements did not result in taxable income.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how attorneys structure divorce settlements involving life insurance policies. It clarifies that premiums paid by one spouse on a policy owned by the other are not taxable income if they do not provide an economic benefit and are part of a property settlement. Legal practitioners should ensure that such arrangements are clearly documented as property settlements rather than alimony. This case may also influence future IRS audits of similar arrangements, requiring a careful analysis of whether the policy owner derives an economic benefit from the premiums. Subsequent cases have cited Ostrov to support the non-taxability of such payments when structured similarly.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.