Clark v. Commissioner, 58 T. C. 976 (1972)

Payments made pursuant to a written instrument incident to divorce can be considered periodic alimony payments if they meet specified contingencies and are for support, even if not incorporated into the divorce decree.

Summary

Clark v. Commissioner addresses whether payments made by Randal Clark to Janice Clark in 1967 should be treated as periodic alimony payments under the Internal Revenue Code. The case hinged on a separate letter agreement that reduced payments upon Janice's remarriage. The Tax Court held that $3,000 of the $3,600 paid was periodic alimony, deductible by Randal and includable in Janice's income, as the letter agreement was deemed a written instrument incident to divorce, satisfying the statutory contingencies for periodic payments.

Facts

Randal and Janice Clark divorced in 1964, with the divorce decree stipulating Randal to pay Janice $300 monthly for 7 years as alimony. A separate letter agreement, not incorporated into the decree, reduced payments to $50 per month if Janice remarried. In 1967, Randal paid Janice $3,600, claiming a $3,000 deduction as alimony, while Janice did not report these payments as income. The IRS challenged these positions, leading to a dispute over the nature of the payments.

Procedural History

The IRS issued deficiency notices to both Randal and Janice Clark, asserting conflicting positions to protect revenue. Both parties petitioned the Tax Court. After trial, the court issued a decision in favor of Randal, treating $3,000 of the payments as periodic alimony under Section 71(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $3,000 paid by Randal Clark to Janice Clark in 1967 qualifies as periodic alimony payments under Section 71(a) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. Yes, because the payments met the conditions for periodic alimony as they were subject to a remarriage contingency and were for Janice's support, as established by the letter agreement dated February 21, 1964.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the letter agreement, though not part of the divorce decree, was a written instrument incident to the divorce. It established a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

contingency (Janice's remarriage) that could reduce the monthly payments, satisfying Section 1. 71-1(d)(3)(i) of the Income Tax Regulations. The court emphasized that the payments were for Janice's support, not a property division, and that the letter agreement reflected a prior oral agreement essential to the divorce settlement. The court cited precedent affirming that state law does not affect the federal tax treatment of alimony, and that agreements incident to divorce need not be incorporated into the divorce decree to qualify under Section 71(a). The court rejected Janice's arguments that the letter agreement lacked consideration and was not enforceable, finding mutual promises and obligations between the parties sufficient.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of understanding the nuances of alimony agreements and their tax implications. For attorneys and tax professionals, it highlights that separate agreements can be considered incident to divorce for tax purposes, even if not part of the decree. Practitioners should draft clear contingencies in alimony agreements to ensure they qualify as periodic payments under Section 71(a). This decision may influence how alimony agreements are structured in jurisdictions where such agreements cannot be incorporated into divorce decrees. Subsequent cases have followed this ruling, reaffirming the broad interpretation of "incident to divorce" and the significance of support-focused agreements in alimony tax treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.