Keinath v. Commissioner, 58 T. C. 352 (1972)

A disclaimer must be made within a reasonable time after learning of the transfer to avoid gift tax liability.

Summary

Cargill MacMillan disclaimed his vested remainder interest in a trust after the death of the life beneficiary, his mother, in an attempt to pass the assets to his children without gift tax consequences. The U. S. Tax Court held that his disclaimer was not made within a reasonable time after he learned of the transfer, which occurred upon the trust's creation nearly 19 years earlier. As a result, the court ruled that Cargill's disclaimer constituted a taxable gift under section 2511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. This decision emphasizes the importance of timely disclaimers to avoid gift tax liability and impacts estate planning strategies.

Facts

John H. MacMillan's will established a trust, with the income to be paid to his wife for her life, and upon her death, the trust assets to be divided equally between his two sons, Cargill and John Jr. , or their descendants per stirpes if they predeceased her. John died in 1944, and Cargill served as trustee after John Jr. 's death in 1960. In 1963, after his mother's death, Cargill executed a disclaimer of his interest in the trust, seeking to pass his share to his children. The local court approved the disclaimer, but the IRS challenged it as a taxable gift.

Procedural History

The Tax Court consolidated cases involving Cargill's children and a trust he established, all related to the tax implications of his disclaimer. The court focused on whether the disclaimer was a taxable gift under section 2511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Cargill's disclaimer of his interest in the trust was a taxable gift under section 2511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because Cargill's disclaimer was not made within a reasonable time after learning of the transfer, it constituted a taxable gift to his children.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the gift tax statute, section 2511(a), which broadly taxes transfers in the nature of gifts. The court noted that a valid disclaimer under local law can

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

avoid gift tax if made within a reasonable time after learning of the transfer, as per section 25. 2511-1(c) of the Gift Tax Regulations. Cargill knew of his interest since the trust's creation in 1944 and failed to disclaim until nearly 19 years later, after his mother's death. The court rejected arguments that the disclaimer's validity depended solely on state law or that the timing should be measured from when the interest became indefeasible. The court emphasized that the disclaimer was not made within a reasonable time, citing *Kathryn S. Fuller*, and thus treated it as an acceptance of the interest followed by a taxable gift to his children.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the need for timely disclaimers to avoid gift tax liability. Estate planners must advise clients to disclaim unwanted interests promptly after learning of them, rather than using disclaimers as a tool for estate planning or tax avoidance. The ruling affects how similar cases involving disclaimers are analyzed, particularly regarding the timing of such actions. It also influences estate and gift tax planning strategies, requiring practitioners to consider the potential tax consequences of delayed disclaimers. Subsequent cases have cited *Keinath* when addressing the timeliness of disclaimers and their tax implications.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.