Estate of Effie Kells Jones, Deceased, Citizens First National Bank of Ridgewood, Administrator c. t. a. , Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 56 T. C. 35 (1971)

A power of appointment is considered a general power of appointment for estate tax purposes if it is exercisable in favor of the decedent, even if held jointly with a corporate trustee, and is not limited by an ascertainable standard relating to health, education, support, or maintenance.

Summary

Effie Kells Jones was a cotrustee and life beneficiary of a testamentary trust established by her husband's will, which allowed for principal invasions for her 'care, maintenance, health, welfare and well-being. ' The U. S. Tax Court held that this power was not limited by an ascertainable standard, making it a general power of appointment created after October 21, 1942. Therefore, the trust's value was includable in her estate for tax purposes. The court rejected arguments that the power was limited or that its classification as post-1942 was retroactive, emphasizing that the power's broad discretion and the decedent's status as a coholder did not exempt it from estate tax inclusion.

Facts

Effie Kells Jones was married to J. Morgan Jones, who created a testamentary trust in his will dated April 29, 1940. Upon his death on July 10, 1949, Effie and the Commercial Trust Company of New Jersey were appointed cotrustees. The trust provided Effie with income for life and allowed principal invasions for her 'care, maintenance, health, welfare and well-being' in cases of emergency or situations affecting those aspects. Effie died on November 11, 1965, without any principal invasions having been made. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the trust's value should be included in her estate, leading to a deficiency in estate tax.

Procedural History

The estate filed a Federal estate tax return on January 19, 1967, without including the trust's value. The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency on May 12, 1969, including the trust's value. The estate petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which heard the case and issued its decision on April 8, 1971.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the power of appointment held by Effie Kells Jones was limited by an ascertainable standard relating to health, education, support, or maintenance.
2. Whether the decedent's status as a coholder of the power with a corporate trustee affected its classification as a general power of appointment.
3. Whether classifying the power as created after October 21, 1942, required the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

application of retroactive legislation.

Holding

1. No, because the power to invade principal for ‘welfare and well-being’ extended beyond an ascertainable standard.
2. No, because a coholder of a power has a general power of appointment if it can be exercised in their favor, even with a corporate trustee.
3. No, because the classification of the power was determined by law effective before the testator’s death, and the taxing statute applied prospectively.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied section 2041 of the Internal Revenue Code, which defines a general power of appointment as one exercisable in favor of the decedent. The power granted to Effie was not limited by an ascertainable standard as it allowed invasions for ‘welfare and well-being,’ which the court found to be broader than health, education, support, or maintenance. The court cited cases and regulations supporting this interpretation, emphasizing that the power’s broad language suggested an intent for liberal invasions in favor of the decedent. The court also rejected the argument that the decedent’s status as a coholder with a corporate trustee negated the general nature of the power, citing section 2041 and regulations that a coholder has no adverse interest merely because of joint possession of the power. Finally, the court found that the power was created after October 21, 1942, under the law effective at the time of the testator’s death, and the taxing statute did not apply retroactively.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that a power of appointment is considered general for estate tax purposes if it is exercisable in favor of the decedent, even if held jointly with a corporate trustee, and is not limited by an ascertainable standard. Practitioners should carefully draft trust provisions to avoid unintended tax consequences, ensuring that any discretionary power to invade principal is clearly limited to an ascertainable standard if the intent is to exclude the trust’s value from the decedent’s estate. The decision also reinforces the importance of understanding the effective date of tax legislation and its application to powers created by will, as the classification of a power can significantly impact estate tax liability. Subsequent cases, such as Miller v. United States and Estate of Josephine R. Lanigan, have followed this reasoning in similar circumstances.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.