Estate of Edward E. Dickinson, Jr. v. Commissioner, 68 T. C. 797 (1977)

Agreements that allow for the setting aside of a buy-sell agreement when the IRS disregards it for estate tax valuation are valid and enforceable.

Summary

In Estate of Edward E. Dickinson, Jr. v. Commissioner, the court addressed whether a 1962 agreement allowing the estate to set aside a 1961 buy-sell agreement was enforceable when the IRS disregarded the buy-sell agreement's formula price for estate tax valuation. The court found that the 1962 agreement was valid, allowing the estate to disregard the formula price and use the fair market value for both valuation and estate administration purposes. This decision upheld the decedent's intent to avoid tax discrepancies and preserved the estate's plan for distributing assets, including marital and charitable gifts, without burdening them with additional taxes.

Facts

Edward E. Dickinson, Jr. died on November 22, 1968. His will included provisions for his wife, children, and charitable institutions, with a tax clause directing that all estate taxes be paid as administration expenses without proration among beneficiaries. Dickinson owned 8,795 shares of E. E. Dickinson Co. stock, subject to a 1961 buy-sell agreement with the company that set a formula price for the shares. After learning that the IRS might not accept this formula for estate tax purposes, Dickinson and his family entered into a 1962 agreement. This agreement allowed the estate to set aside the 1961 agreement if the IRS disregarded its price for tax valuation. The IRS did challenge the formula price, valuing the shares at fair market value instead. The estate then invoked the 1962 agreement, releasing it from the obligation to sell the shares at the formula price.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the estate's tax return, arguing that the 1962 agreement was void and that the 1961 agreement should still apply for estate administration purposes. The estate contested this in the Tax Court, which heard the case and issued its opinion in 1977.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the 1962 agreement, which allowed the estate to set aside the 1961 buy-sell agreement if the IRS disregarded its price for estate tax valuation, is valid and enforceable.

Holding

1. Yes, because the 1962 agreement was a reasonable means to anticipate and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

counteract potential adverse actions by the IRS, ensuring consistency between the tax valuation and estate administration.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the 1962 agreement was valid as it did not attempt to nullify the IRS’s valuation but sought to maintain consistency in estate administration. The court emphasized that Dickinson had sought legal advice and entered the 1962 agreement to avoid discrepancies between tax valuation and estate distribution. The court distinguished this case from Commissioner v. Procter, where a revocation clause was deemed void for discouraging administrative action. Here, the 1962 agreement was seen as a legitimate response to the IRS’s position on the 1961 agreement’s formula price. The court cited precedents like Estate of Arthur H. Hull and Estate of Mary Redding Shedd, supporting the validity of agreements that respond to potential tax challenges. The decision ensured that the estate could follow Dickinson’s intent without burdening marital and charitable gifts with additional taxes.

Practical Implications

This decision allows estates to enter into agreements that can adjust or set aside buy-sell agreements if the IRS challenges the valuation used in those agreements. Attorneys should advise clients on the potential for such agreements to ensure that estate plans align with tax outcomes, avoiding discrepancies that could affect the distribution of assets. The ruling reinforces the enforceability of agreements designed to maintain the integrity of estate plans against IRS challenges. Subsequent cases like Estate of Inez G. Coleman have further supported the use of such agreements in estate planning, emphasizing their role in providing certainty and fairness in estate administration.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.