Hardy v. Commissioner, 59 T. C. 857 (1973)

Lump-sum payments, even if labeled as support, are not deductible as alimony under IRC Sections 71 and 215 unless paid over more than 10 years.

Summary

In Hardy v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed whether a $5,000 payment made by William Hardy to his ex-wife upon her remarriage was deductible as alimony. The divorce decree required monthly support payments to end upon the ex-wife's remarriage but also mandated a $5,000 payment if she remarried in 1966. The court held that this lump-sum payment was not deductible under IRC Sections 71 and 215, as it was a principal sum rather than a periodic payment. The decision clarifies the distinction between periodic and lump-sum payments in alimony deductions, impacting how divorce agreements are structured for tax purposes.

Facts

William M. Hardy and Gwenivere C. Hardy divorced in 1966. The divorce decree required Hardy to pay $450 monthly for his ex-wife's support, which was to terminate upon her death, remarriage, or after eight years. Additionally, the decree stipulated a $5,000 payment to Gwenivere if she remarried in 1966. Gwenivere remarried in December 1966, and Hardy paid her $5,000 in 1967. Hardy claimed a deduction for the $5,000 payment as alimony on his 1967 tax return, which the Commissioner disallowed, leading to this case.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Hardy's 1967 income tax and disallowed the $5,000 deduction. Hardy petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The court heard the case and issued its opinion on March 29, 1973, denying Hardy's deduction for the lump-sum payment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a $5,000 payment made by Hardy to his ex-wife upon her remarriage is deductible as alimony under IRC Sections 71 and 215.

Holding

1. No, because the $5,000 payment was a principal sum, not a periodic payment as required for deductibility under IRC Sections 71 and 215.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied IRC Sections 71 and 215, which distinguish between periodic and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. | 1

installment payments. Periodic payments are deductible and includable in the recipient's income, while lump-sum payments are not unless paid over more than 10 years. The court found that the $5,000 payment was a separate obligation from the monthly payments, contingent on Gwenivere's remarriage, and thus a principal sum. The court cited prior cases like Edward Bartsch and Jean Cattier, where similar lump-sum payments were deemed non-deductible. The court rejected Hardy's argument that the $5,000 payment should be considered a periodic payment, emphasizing the distinct nature of the payment as outlined in the divorce decree. The court's decision was influenced by the need to maintain consistency in the application of tax law to divorce agreements and to prevent tax avoidance through the mischaracterization of payments.

Practical Implications

Hardy v. Commissioner clarifies that lump-sum payments, even if intended for support, are not deductible as alimony unless they are part of an installment plan lasting over 10 years. This ruling impacts how attorneys draft divorce agreements, ensuring that payments intended to be deductible are structured as periodic payments. The decision also affects taxpayers in similar situations, requiring them to carefully review their divorce agreements for tax implications. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, distinguishing between periodic and lump-sum payments in alimony contexts. Businesses and individuals involved in divorce proceedings must consider these tax implications when negotiating settlement terms.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.