

***Estate of Martha K. Campbell, Deceased, Donor, Lillian S. Campbell, Administratrix, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 59 T. C. 133 (1972)***

A transfer of property for less than full consideration is considered a taxable gift to the extent the value of the property exceeds the consideration received.

**Summary**

Martha Campbell inherited a partnership interest from her husband with full power to dispose of it as she pleased, except for testamentary disposition. She sold this interest to her son George for significantly less than its value. The Tax Court held that this constituted a taxable gift under IRC section 2512(b), as the difference between the property's value and the amount received was deemed a gift. The decision clarifies that under Kentucky law, Martha had a general power of appointment over the estate, and her failure to file a gift tax return resulted in an addition to tax under IRC section 6651(a).

**Facts**

Tilman H. Campbell's will bequeathed his estate, including a partnership interest in T. H. Campbell & Bros. , to his wife Martha, giving her complete and exclusive power to dispose of the estate as she wished. Upon his death in July 1964, the partnership interest was valued at \$145,954. In January 1965, Martha sold her interest in the partnership to her son George for \$22,992. 78. Subsequently, the partnership was incorporated, and George was listed as the sole owner of the partnership assets. Martha did not file a gift tax return for this transaction and died in 1968 without having transferred any other interest in the partnership.

**Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a gift tax deficiency and an addition to tax for Martha Campbell's failure to file a gift tax return. The Estate of Martha Campbell, represented by Lillian S. Campbell as administratrix, contested the deficiency in the U. S. Tax Court, arguing that Martha had transferred only a life estate and received full value for it. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, finding that Martha transferred her entire interest in the partnership and failed to show reasonable cause for not filing a gift tax return.

**Issue(s)**

1. Whether Martha Campbell made a taxable gift when she transferred her interest in the partnership to her son George for less than its full value.
2. Whether the estate is liable for an addition to tax under IRC section 6651(a) for Martha's failure to file a gift tax return.

**Holding**

1. Yes, because under Kentucky law, Martha held a general power of appointment over the estate, and the transfer of the partnership interest for less than its full value constituted a gift under IRC section 2512(b).
2. Yes, because Martha's failure to file a gift tax return was not due to reasonable cause and thus incurred an addition to tax under IRC section 6651(a).

### **Court's Reasoning**

The court analyzed Kentucky law to determine that Martha Campbell had received a general power of appointment over her husband's estate, allowing her to dispose of it as she wished except by testamentary disposition. The court cited *Lanciscus v. Louisville Trust Co.*, 201 Ky. 222 (1923), to support this interpretation. The court found no evidence that Martha transferred only a life estate, as argued by the petitioner, but rather her entire interest in the partnership. The court applied IRC section 2512(b), which deems a transfer for less than full value a gift to the extent of the difference. Regarding the addition to tax, the court rejected the argument that Martha's unawareness of the tax consequences constituted reasonable cause, citing *Robert A. Henningsen*, 26 T. C. 528 (1956), and upheld the addition under IRC section 6651(a).

### **Practical Implications**

This decision emphasizes the importance of understanding state property law in determining federal tax consequences. It serves as a reminder to practitioners that a transfer of property for less than full value can trigger gift tax obligations, even if the transferor believes they are transferring a lesser interest. The case highlights the necessity of filing gift tax returns when such transfers occur and the potential for additions to tax for failure to file. Legal professionals should advise clients on the implications of transferring assets under a will that grants broad powers, and the need to consider potential tax liabilities. This ruling has been cited in subsequent cases involving similar issues of property transfers and tax obligations.