Bobby R. Casey, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 60 T. C. 68 (1973)

Arrearage payments made in the current year cannot be considered as child support for that year if they exceed the current year's obligation, affecting dependency exemptions for divorced parents.

Summary

In Casey v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that child support arrearages paid in the current year cannot be counted toward the support requirement for dependency exemptions if they exceed the current year's obligation. Bobby Casey, a divorced father, argued for dependency exemptions for his daughters, but the court found that his payments, including $750 in arrearages for previous years, did not meet the support test for 1968 under Section 152(e) of the Internal Revenue Code. The decision clarified that only current year's support payments count toward the exemption, impacting how divorced parents can claim dependency exemptions.

Facts

Bobby R. Casey, a divorced father from Texas, sought dependency exemptions for his two daughters, Lisa and Linda, who lived with their mother, Sidonia Casey Jones, after the divorce in 1964. The divorce decree required Casey to pay $1,200 annually for the children's support. In 1967, Casey paid $450, and in 1968, he paid $1,950, which included $750 in arrearages for previous years. The total support for Linda in 1968 was $1,805. 74, and for Lisa, $1,605. 39, with the remainder provided by the custodial parent and her new husband.

Procedural History

Casey filed his Federal income tax returns for 1967 and 1968 and claimed dependency exemptions for his daughters. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied these exemptions, leading to a deficiency determination. Casey petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which heard the case and ultimately ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether arrearage payments made in the current year can be considered child support payments for the current year for the purpose of determining dependency exemptions under Section 152(e) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether Section 152(e) of the Internal Revenue Code, as interpreted, discriminates against divorced parents in violation of due process.

Holding

1. No, because arrearage payments in excess of the current year's obligation are not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

considered child support payments for the current year, as established in prior cases such as Thomas Lovett and Allen F. Labay.
2. No, because Section 152(e) does not discriminate against divorced parents and is constitutional, as it provides rules for determining which parent is entitled to dependency exemptions.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 152(e) of the Internal Revenue Code, which governs dependency exemptions for children of divorced parents. It relied on established precedent from cases like Thomas Lovett, Frank P. Gajda, and Allen F. Labay, which clarified that arrearage payments cannot be counted toward the support requirement for the current year if they exceed the current year's obligation. The court emphasized that this rule prevents parents from shifting support payments between years to gain tax advantages and ensures that the custodial parent's contributions are fairly considered. The court also rejected Casey's constitutional argument, stating that Section 152(e) does not discriminate against divorced parents but rather provides a framework for determining dependency exemptions. The court quoted from the Labay case, stating, "The rule in Lovett prevents a father from claiming exemptions, to which he might not ordinarily be entitled, by shifting child support from one year to another. "

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for divorced parents seeking dependency exemptions. It clarifies that only payments made for the current year's support obligation can be considered when determining eligibility for exemptions, and any arrearages paid in excess of the current year's obligation do not count. This ruling affects how divorced parents plan their support payments and claim exemptions, potentially impacting their tax planning strategies. Practitioners should advise clients to ensure timely payments to maximize their eligibility for exemptions. The decision also reinforces the court's interpretation of Section 152(e) as constitutional, providing clarity on the legal framework for dependency exemptions in divorce cases. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, further solidifying the rule on arrearage payments and dependency exemptions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.