Hopkins v. Commissioner, 55 T. C. 538 (1970)

A taxpayer must prove that they provided more than half of a child's total support to claim a dependency exemption, even for children of divorced parents.

Summary

In Hopkins v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that Harvey Hopkins could not claim dependency exemptions for his four children from a prior marriage because he failed to prove that he provided over half of their total support in 1967. The court emphasized that the burden of proof lies with the taxpayer to establish both their contributions and that these exceeded half of the children's total support. This case underscores the importance of providing clear evidence of support contributions when claiming dependency exemptions, particularly in the context of children of divorced parents.

Facts

Harvey L. Hopkins was divorced from Lorraine Hopkins Koester in 1960, with custody of their four children awarded to Lorraine. In 1967, the children lived with Lorraine and her parents in Kentucky. Hopkins contributed $20 weekly ($1,040 annually) to their support and claimed additional expenses totaling $865. 88 for gifts, travel, and living expenses during the children's visits to him in Florida. The IRS disallowed dependency exemptions for the children, asserting Hopkins did not prove he provided over half of their support.

Procedural History

Hopkins filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's disallowance of dependency exemptions for his four children for the tax year 1967. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's determination, ruling in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Harvey Hopkins provided more than half of the total support for his four children in 1967, thereby entitling him to claim them as dependents under Section 152(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because Hopkins failed to prove that he provided more than half of the children's total support in 1967. The court found that Hopkins did not present sufficient evidence to establish the total support received by the children from all sources, thus failing to meet the burden of proof required under Section 152(a).

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court applied Section 152(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, which defines a dependent as a child receiving over half of their support from the taxpayer. The court noted that while Hopkins provided evidence of his contributions, he did not establish the total support received by the children, making it impossible to determine if his contributions exceeded half. The court rejected Hopkins's argument that legal responsibility for support automatically entitled him to exemptions, citing previous cases like Aaron F. Vance and John L. Donner, Sr. , which clarified that actual support, not just legal obligation, is required. The court also ruled that certain expenses claimed by Hopkins, such as travel and prorated housing costs during visits, did not constitute support under the law.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the necessity for taxpayers to provide clear and comprehensive evidence of support when claiming dependency exemptions, especially in cases involving children of divorced parents. It affects how attorneys advise clients on tax planning and dependency claims, emphasizing the need for detailed records of all support contributions and total support received by the child. The ruling impacts divorced parents seeking to claim children as dependents and may influence future cases by requiring a higher evidentiary standard for proving support. It also highlights the distinction between legal obligations to support and the actual provision of support for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.