# Lord v. Commissioner, 60 T. C. 199 (1973)

Income earned during a permanent marital separation may be treated as separate property under Washington law, even before a legal divorce.

### **Summary**

Robert Lord moved to Washington in 1960, leaving his wife and children in Iowa. He established residency and a stable job in Washington in 1962. The court held that Lord's income from 1961 through August 1965 was his separate property because his marriage had substantively dissolved by 1962, despite the legal divorce not occurring until 1965. The court also found that Lord's failure to file tax returns was not due to fraud, but he was liable for other tax penalties due to his intentional disregard of tax obligations.

#### **Facts**

Robert Lord left his wife Marian and their children in Iowa in March 1960 and moved to Seattle, Washington. Initially, he worked irregularly as a salesman and struggled with alcoholism. In 1961, he obtained a real estate license and started working for MacPherson's, Inc., selling beach property. By 1962, he was promoted to sales manager, established a permanent residence in Ocean Shores, Washington, and began acquiring real property there. From 1960 to 1965, he had minimal contact with his family and provided negligible financial support. Marian initiated divorce proceedings in 1965, which were finalized on August 2, 1965. Lord did not file federal income tax returns for the years 1961 through 1966 and was later convicted for willful failure to file for 1962.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies and fraud penalties against Lord for the years 1961 through 1966. Lord petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the community property status of his income and the fraud penalties. The Tax Court held that Lord's income was his separate property and that the fraud penalties did not apply, but upheld other tax penalties.

#### Issue(s)

- 1. Whether Lord's income earned from January 1, 1961, through August 2, 1965, constituted community property or his separate property under Washington law.
- 2. Whether Lord's failure to pay federal income tax for the taxable years 1961 through 1966 was due to fraud.

# Holding

1. No, because by 1962, Lord and his wife had manifested their intent to renounce their marital community, making his income separate property under Washington law.

2. No, because the Commissioner did not establish by clear and convincing evidence that Lord's failure to file was due to fraud.

# **Court's Reasoning**

The court applied Washington law to determine the community property status of Lord's income, as he was domiciled in Washington. It found that Lord established domicile in Washington in 1962 based on his physical presence, regular residence, stable employment, and acquisition of real property. The court also noted that Lord and Marian's mutual disinterest in maintaining their marriage, evidenced by their lack of contact and support, demonstrated a substantive dissolution of their marital community by 1962. On the fraud issue, the court considered the entire record and found that Lord's failure to file was influenced by his fear of prosecution for not filing in 1960 and his underlying emotional problems, rather than a fraudulent intent to evade taxes. The court emphasized that the burden of proof for fraud was on the Commissioner, who did not meet the clear and convincing standard.

### **Practical Implications**

This case illustrates that for tax purposes, a marital community may be considered dissolved before a legal divorce if the spouses' actions demonstrate a permanent separation. Legal practitioners should advise clients in community property states to consider the practical dissolution of their marriage when assessing the community property status of income. The ruling also highlights the high burden of proof required for fraud penalties, emphasizing that factors such as inadequate record-keeping or failure to file may not constitute fraud if other plausible explanations exist. Subsequent cases have applied this principle to similar situations involving marital separation and community property.