Sohosky v. Commissioner, 57 T. C. 403 (1971)

A testamentary power to dispose of property during one's lifetime can include the power to transfer full ownership, not just a life estate, depending on the language of the will.

Summary

In Sohosky v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that Eva Sohosky's transfer of stock to her sons under her husband's will constituted a transfer of full ownership, not merely a life estate. John J. Sohosky, Sr. 's will granted Eva a life estate with the power to sell or dispose of the property as she saw fit. The sons argued they purchased only Eva's life interest, seeking deductions for its exhaustion. However, the court found that Eva's power to dispose included transferring complete ownership, thus the stock was not a wasting asset eligible for such deductions.

Facts

John J. Sohosky, Sr. died in 1963, leaving most of his estate, including 1,498 shares of Lewis Motor Supply Co. , to his wife Eva for life with the power to sell or dispose of the property as she saw fit. In 1965, Eva transferred the stock to her sons, John Jr. and Henry, under a contract. A subsequent 1966 contract confirmed this transfer, giving the sons unconditional ownership of the stock without restrictions. The sons claimed tax deductions for the exhaustion of Eva's life interest in the stock.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the sons' income tax returns for 1966, 1967, and 1968, leading to the case being brought before the United States Tax Court. The court's decision was for the respondent, denying the deductions claimed by the sons.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Eva Sohosky transferred only a life interest in the stock to her sons, entitling them to deductions for the exhaustion of that interest.
2. Whether the stock transferred to the sons was a wasting asset, allowing deductions for its gradual exhaustion.

Holding

1. No, because Eva's power to dispose under the will included the power to transfer full ownership of the stock to her sons.
2. No, because the stock was an intangible asset with an unlimited or not reasonably ascertainable useful life, thus not a wasting asset.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court analyzed John Sr. ‘s will to determine his intent, finding that the language granting Eva the power to “sell or dispose of” the property “as she may see fit during her lifetime” allowed her to transfer full ownership. This interpretation was supported by Missouri case law and the specific phrasing in the will. The court rejected the sons’ argument that Eva’s power was limited to transferring only a life estate, emphasizing that the will’s language did not restrict her disposal power. The court also noted that the 1966 contract explicitly stated the sons were unconditional owners of the stock, further supporting the conclusion that the stock was not a wasting asset eligible for exhaustion deductions.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that a broad power to dispose under a will can include the transfer of full ownership, impacting estate planning and tax strategies. Attorneys must carefully draft wills to specify the extent of disposal powers if limited to life estates. Tax practitioners should note that stock, even if transferred under such powers, is typically not considered a wasting asset for deduction purposes. The ruling may influence future cases involving similar testamentary language and could affect how estates are valued and taxed, particularly in family businesses where stock ownership is central to the estate’s value.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.