Estate of Maurice Gustave Heckscher v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1975-29

Fair market value of closely held stock for estate tax purposes requires consideration of net asset value and earning/dividend potential; attorney's fees incurred by a beneficiary to defend their inheritance are generally not deductible as estate administration expenses.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed two primary issues: the valuation of closely held stock (Anahma Realty Corp.) for estate tax purposes and the deductibility of attorney's fees incurred by the decedent's widow to defend her inheritance against a claim from the decedent's former wife. The court determined the fair market value of the stock should consider both net asset value and earning potential, rejecting a purely income-based valuation. Regarding attorney's fees, the court held they were not deductible as estate administration expenses because they were incurred for the widow's personal benefit, not for the benefit of the estate as a whole.

Facts

Decedent Maurice Gustave Heckscher had a general power of appointment over 2,500 shares of Anahma Realty Corp. stock held in trust. He exercised this power in his will, appointing the stock to his surviving spouse, Ilene. Anahma was a personal holding company with significant assets, including a subsidiary, Hernasco, which owned undeveloped land in Florida. The estate tax return valued the Anahma stock at $50 per share. A dispute arose when decedent's former wife claimed a portion of the trust property based on a prior agreement. Ilene incurred legal fees defending her right to the stock.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the decedent's estate tax, disputing the valuation of the Anahma stock and the deductibility of attorney's fees. The Estate of Heckscher petitioned the Tax Court for review. The Tax Court heard evidence and expert testimony to determine the fair market value of the stock and the deductibility of the legal fees.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the fair market value of the 2,500 shares of Anahma Realty Corp. stock at the date of decedent's death was correctly determined by the Commissioner.
2. Whether attorney's fees incurred by the decedent's wife in defending her claim to trust property appointed to her under decedent's will are deductible by the estate as administrative expenses under section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, the Commissioner's valuation was not entirely correct. The fair market value of the Anahma stock was determined to be $100 per share.
2. No, the attorney's fees incurred by the decedent's wife are not deductible as estate administration expenses.

Court's Reasoning

Stock Valuation: The court found both the estate's expert (income-based valuation) and the Commissioner's expert (net asset value-based valuation) had flaws in their approaches. The court emphasized that fair market value is "*the price at which the property would change hands between a willing buyer and a willing seller*." For closely held stock like Anahma, which was not publicly traded and was a personal holding company, valuation must consider multiple factors, including net asset value, earning power, and dividend-paying capacity. The court rejected a purely income-based approach as unrealistic, stating, "*This narrow approach, based on future earnings and dividends, would exclude any consideration of underlying asset value.*" While net asset value was significant, the lack of marketability and control associated with a minority interest required a discount. The court ultimately weighed all factors and determined a value of $100 per share, a compromise between the experts' valuations, reflecting a bargain between a hypothetical willing buyer and seller.

Attorney's Fees: The court relied on Treasury Regulation § 20.2053-3(c)(3), which states that "*Attorney's fees incurred by beneficiaries incident to litigation as to their respective interest do not constitute a proper deduction, inasmuch as expenses of this character are incurred on behalf of the beneficiaries personally and are not administration expenses.*" The court distinguished this case from situations where litigation is essential for the proper settlement of the estate. Here, the legal fees were incurred by Ilene to protect her personal interest as the beneficiary against a claim by a third party (decedent's former wife). The court concluded these fees were not "*incurred in winding up the affairs of the deceased*" and thus were not deductible as estate administration expenses under section 2053(b), which applies to property not subject to claims.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on valuing closely held stock for estate tax purposes, highlighting the need to consider both asset-based and income-based valuation methods. It emphasizes that no single method is universally applicable and that a balanced approach, reflecting a hypothetical negotiation between buyer and seller, is crucial. For estate administration expense deductions, particularly attorney's fees, the case reinforces the principle that expenses must benefit the estate as a whole, not just individual beneficiaries. Legal professionals should carefully distinguish between fees incurred for estate administration and those for beneficiaries' personal

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

benefit when seeking deductions. This case is frequently cited in estate tax valuation and administration expense deduction disputes, particularly concerning closely held businesses and intra-family estate litigation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.