Giordano v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 462 (1975)

Where a divorce agreement unambiguously specifies the allocation of payments between alimony and child support, the court will not consider extrinsic evidence to alter this allocation for tax purposes.

Summary

In Giordano v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed the deductibility of payments made under a divorce decree. The court upheld the IRS's disallowance of a portion of alimony deductions claimed by John Giordano, ruling that the clear terms of the divorce agreement, which allocated 20% of payments as alimony and 80% as child support, could not be altered by extrinsic evidence. The court granted summary judgment on this issue, denying the deduction for the child support portion, but denied summary judgment on another issue regarding contributions to a tax-exempt organization due to genuine factual disputes. This case reinforces the principle that unambiguous written agreements control the tax treatment of divorce payments, and highlights the importance of precise drafting in divorce agreements.

Facts

John C. Giordano and Dorothy Giordano divorced in 1968. Their stipulation, incorporated into the divorce decree, specified that John would pay Dorothy weekly amounts, with 20% designated as alimony and 80% as child support. John claimed deductions for these payments on his tax returns, but the IRS disallowed a portion, asserting that only the alimony portion was deductible. John argued that all payments were intended as alimony, despite the agreement's language. Separately, John claimed deductions for contributions to an organization he believed to be tax-exempt, which the IRS also disallowed.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency for John's 1968-1971 tax returns. John filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging these deficiencies. The Commissioner moved for summary judgment on the alimony and charitable contribution issues. The court granted summary judgment on the alimony issue, upholding the IRS's disallowance, but denied summary judgment on the charitable contribution issue due to factual disputes.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court should grant summary judgment upholding the IRS's disallowance of a portion of alimony deductions claimed by John Giordano, where the divorce agreement clearly allocated payments between alimony and child support.
2. Whether the Tax Court should grant summary judgment upholding the IRS's disallowance of deductions for contributions to an allegedly tax-exempt

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

organization.

Holding

1. Yes, because the divorce agreement unambiguously specified that 20% of the payments were alimony and 80% were child support, and under the rule established in Commissioner v. Lester, extrinsic evidence cannot alter this allocation.
2. No, because there was a genuine issue of material fact regarding the tax-exempt status of the organization and the deductibility of the contributions.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied heavily on the Supreme Court's decision in Commissioner v. Lester, which held that when a divorce agreement unambiguously allocates payments between alimony and child support, the court cannot consider extrinsic evidence to alter this allocation. The Giordano divorce agreement clearly stated that 20% of payments were alimony and 80% were child support, leaving no room for interpretation or extrinsic evidence. The court rejected John's argument that the payments were intended as alimony, emphasizing that the unambiguous language of the agreement controlled. On the charitable contribution issue, the court found that the IRS's motion for summary judgment lacked sufficient evidence to establish that no genuine factual dispute existed regarding the organization's tax-exempt status and the deductibility of John's contributions.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of precise drafting in divorce agreements, as the terms will control the tax treatment of payments. Attorneys drafting such agreements should ensure that allocations between alimony and child support are clear and unambiguous, as courts will not consider extrinsic evidence to alter these allocations. Taxpayers and their advisors should carefully review divorce agreements to determine the tax implications of payments. The case also illustrates that factual disputes regarding the tax-exempt status of organizations and the deductibility of contributions may preclude summary judgment, requiring a trial on the merits. Subsequent cases have followed Giordano in upholding the principle that clear divorce agreement language controls tax treatment, emphasizing the need for careful drafting and review in this area of law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.