Karl D. Pettit and Estelle F. Pettit, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 61 T. C. 634 (1974)

The dedication of land to a municipality as a condition for subdivision approval does not constitute a charitable contribution under IRC Section 170 due to lack of donative intent.

Summary

In Pettit v. Commissioner, the taxpayers sought to deduct the value of land dedicated to Princeton Township for road widening as a charitable contribution. The dedication was required to obtain subdivision approval for their estate planning. The Tax Court held that the dedication did not qualify as a charitable contribution because it lacked the necessary donative intent. The taxpayers' primary motivation was to secure subdivision approval, not to make a charitable gift. The court emphasized that the subsequent invalidation of the ordinance requiring the dedication did not retroactively change the taxpayers' intent at the time of the conveyance.

Facts

Karl and Estelle Pettit sought to combine two lots into one for estate planning purposes, which required subdivision approval from Princeton Township. The township's ordinance mandated dedicating additional land for road widening as a condition for subdivision approval. The Pettits dedicated 2. 75 acres for this purpose. After the conveyance, a New Jersey court declared the ordinance unconstitutional. The Pettits claimed a charitable deduction for the land's value on their 1967 tax return, which the Commissioner disallowed, asserting the dedication was not a voluntary gift.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the Pettits' 1967 federal income tax and disallowed their claimed charitable deduction. The Pettits petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court heard the case and issued its opinion on February 7, 1974, upholding the Commissioner's disallowance of the deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the dedication of 2. 75 acres to Princeton Township for road widening constituted a charitable contribution under IRC Section 170?

Holding

1. No, because the dedication lacked the requisite donative intent necessary for a charitable contribution. The Pettits' primary motivation was to obtain subdivision

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

approval, not to make a charitable gift.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court analyzed the Pettits’ intent at the time of the dedication. It found that the dedication was compelled by the township’s ordinance, which required additional right-of-way as a condition for subdivision approval. The court cited prior cases establishing that a transfer compelled by legal requirement or made with an expectation of receiving a benefit does not qualify as a charitable gift. The court rejected the Pettits’ argument that the subsequent invalidation of the ordinance changed their intent at the time of the conveyance. It emphasized that the dominant reason for the dedication was to secure subdivision approval, not to make a charitable contribution. The court also noted that the Pettits’ attempt to dedicate more land than required was motivated by expectations of future benefits, not charitable intent.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that land dedications required for subdivision approval do not qualify as charitable contributions, even if the requiring ordinance is later invalidated. Taxpayers should not expect to claim charitable deductions for land dedicated to municipalities in exchange for development approvals. The ruling underscores the importance of donative intent in determining the deductibility of contributions. It also highlights the principle of annual tax accounting, which focuses on the taxpayer’s intent and circumstances at the time of the transaction. Practitioners advising clients on real estate development should be aware that dedications made to secure government approvals will not be deductible as charitable contributions, regardless of subsequent legal developments.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.