Estate of Frothingham v. Commissioner, 60 T. C. 211 (1973)

For estate tax purposes, consideration must be received by the decedent to exclude property from the gross estate under Section 2043(a).

Summary

In Estate of Frothingham v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that property subject to a general power of appointment must be included in the decedent's gross estate unless he received adequate and full consideration for it. Charles Frothingham acquired a power of appointment through a will contest settlement, but did not receive consideration for exercising it. The court held that Section 2043(a) of the Internal Revenue Code only applies to consideration received by the decedent, not consideration given by him. This decision clarifies that for estate tax purposes, the focus is on what the decedent received, not what he paid, when determining whether property is taxable.

Facts

Charles Frothingham contested the will of his cousin George Mifflin, who had inherited a trust from his mother Jane Mifflin. As part of a settlement, George's will was amended to grant Charles a general power of appointment over one-fourth of the trust income. Charles exercised this power at his death, bequeathing the income to his wife. The estate claimed the power was acquired for adequate consideration (Charles' relinquishment of his intestacy rights) and should be excluded from his gross estate under Section 2043(a). The Commissioner argued the power must be included because Charles received no consideration for exercising it.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in Charles' estate tax and included the value of the property subject to the power of appointment. Charles' estate filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court, arguing the property should be excluded under Section 2043(a). The Tax Court heard the case and issued its opinion in 1973.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Section 2043(a) of the Internal Revenue Code excludes property from a decedent's gross estate when the decedent gave consideration to acquire a power of appointment, but received no consideration for exercising it.

Holding

1. No, because Section 2043(a) only applies to consideration received by the decedent in connection with the property passing under the power at his death, not consideration given by him to acquire the power.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court, in an opinion by Judge Raum, held that the “adequate and full consideration” clause in Section 2043(a) refers only to consideration received by the decedent, not consideration given by him. The court reasoned that the purpose of the consideration provisions in the estate tax law is to prevent depletion of the decedent’s estate unless replaced by property of equal value that could be taxed at death. The court found no evidence that Congress intended to exclude property from the estate when the decedent paid for a power of appointment. The court interpreted the statutory language, including the terms “created,” “exercised,” and “relinquished,” to relate to acts of the decedent and consideration received by him. The court also noted that accepting the estate’s interpretation would create an easy means of tax avoidance, contrary to legislative intent.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for estate tax purposes, the focus is on what the decedent received, not what he paid, when determining whether property is taxable. Estate planners must ensure that clients receive adequate consideration for any transfers or powers of appointment to avoid inclusion in the gross estate. The ruling prevents tax avoidance schemes where a decedent could purchase a power of appointment and exercise it without incurring estate tax. It also underscores the importance of carefully structuring estate plans to comply with the consideration requirements of Section 2043(a). Subsequent cases have followed this interpretation, reinforcing its impact on estate tax planning and administration.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.