Mirsky v. Commissioner, 56 T. C. 664 (1971)

Payments labeled as alimony in divorce agreements may be considered non-taxable property settlements if they are intended to compensate for the wife's property rights.

Summary

Enid Mirsky received payments labeled as alimony from her former husband Philip Pollak following their divorce. The court held that payments totaling $25,000 were non-taxable as they were in settlement of Mirsky's property rights in the marital home, not alimony. However, weekly payments of $50 totaling $1,000 were taxable as alimony. The court also denied a deduction for legal fees due to insufficient proof that they were related to the taxable alimony. This case highlights the importance of distinguishing between property settlements and alimony for tax purposes.

Facts

Enid Mirsky and Philip Pollak married in 1952 and purchased a home together. They sold this home and used the proceeds to buy another in 1956, holding it as tenants by the entirety. After divorcing in 1964, they entered into a separation agreement incorporated into the divorce decree. The agreement provided Mirsky with household items and payments labeled as alimony: $5,000 immediately, $50 weekly until June 1, 1964, and further payments totaling $25,000 over the next few years. Mirsky did not report these payments as income, arguing they were compensation for her property interest.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Mirsky's income tax for the years 1964-1967, asserting the payments were taxable alimony. Mirsky petitioned the Tax Court, which heard the case and issued its opinion on June 29, 1971.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payments received by Enid Mirsky from Philip Pollak pursuant to the divorce decree and separation agreement are includable in her gross income under section 71(a)(1), I. R. C. 1954?
2. Whether legal fees paid by Enid Mirsky in connection with the divorce proceedings are deductible under section 212, I. R. C. 1954?

Holding

1. No, because the payments aggregating $25,000 were in fact a division of property jointly held during the marriage and thus not includable in gross income. Yes, because the weekly payments of $50 totaling $1,000 were periodic payments in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

discharge of a legal obligation arising out of the marital relationship and thus includable in gross income.
2. No, because Mirsky failed to prove what portion of the legal expenses was attributable to the collection of the taxable alimony.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the rule that payments in divorce agreements labeled as alimony are not determinative for tax purposes. They must be examined to determine if they are truly alimony or a property settlement. The court found that the $25,000 payments were intended to compensate Mirsky for her interest in the marital home, evidenced by the negotiations leading to the agreement and her contributions to the property. These payments were not alimony because they were not for support but rather a division of property. The weekly payments of $50, however, had characteristics of alimony, being small and payable over a short period. The court also considered Indiana law on alimony, which can include property settlements, and the congressional intent for uniform treatment of alimony across states. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that the labels in the agreement should be controlling, citing the need for national uniformity in tax treatment of divorce-related payments.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how attorneys draft divorce agreements and how parties should report payments for tax purposes. It emphasizes the need to clearly distinguish between property settlements and alimony, as the former is not taxable while the latter is. Practitioners must carefully document the intent behind payments to avoid tax disputes. The ruling also affects how courts in similar cases interpret the nature of payments, focusing on the substance over the label. Subsequent cases have applied this principle, reinforcing the need to examine the true purpose of payments in divorce agreements. Businesses and individuals involved in divorce proceedings must consider these tax implications when negotiating settlements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.