Lee v. Commissioner, 64 T. C. 552 (1975)

Marital status for federal tax purposes is determined by the law of the state of domicile, not by a federal standard.

Summary

Harold Lee obtained a Mexican divorce from Doris Lee in 1966, which was not recognized under California law, and then "married" Louise Geise. They filed joint tax returns from 1967 to 1970. The issue was whether they qualified as "husband and wife" under Section 6013 for joint filing. The U. S. Tax Court held that they did not, reaffirming that marital status for tax purposes is governed by state law. Since California did not recognize the Mexican divorce, Harold remained married to Doris, and thus, could not file joint returns with Louise.

Facts

Harold Lee married Doris Lee in 1961. In 1966, Harold obtained an ex parte divorce in Mexico, which was not recognized under California law. Harold then went through a marriage ceremony with Louise Geise in 1967. From 1967 to 1970, Harold and Louise filed joint federal income tax returns. In 1967, Harold filed for divorce from Doris in California, alleging he was still married to her. Doris counterclaimed for divorce on grounds of adultery, naming Louise as correspondent. Louise admitted the invalidity of the Mexican decree but claimed good faith. In 1971, a California court granted a divorce to Harold and Doris.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Harold and Louise's taxes for the years 1967 to 1970, asserting that they were not legally married and thus not entitled to file joint returns. Harold and Louise petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that Harold and Louise were not "husband and wife" under Section 6013 for the years in issue.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Harold Lee and Louise Geise were "husband and wife" within the meaning of Section 6013 of the Internal Revenue Code, allowing them to file joint federal income tax returns for the years 1967 through 1970?

Holding

1. No, because under California law, Harold's Mexican divorce from Doris was invalid, meaning he remained married to Doris during the years in issue and could not legally marry Louise.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reaffirmed its position that marital status for federal tax purposes is determined by state law, not by a federal standard, as previously held in Albert Gersten. The court rejected the “rule of validation” from Borax’ Estate, which suggested a federal standard for marital status. Since both Harold and Doris were domiciled in California, the court looked to California law, which did not recognize the Mexican divorce. Harold’s subsequent actions in California divorce proceedings, including his own allegations of being married to Doris, further indicated that the Mexican divorce was invalid under California law. Therefore, Harold could not be considered married to Louise for tax purposes.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores that practitioners must examine the validity of a divorce under the law of the state of domicile when determining eligibility for joint tax filing. It highlights the importance of state law in tax matters related to marital status, potentially affecting how tax professionals advise clients on the filing status post-divorce or remarriage. The ruling also implies that taxpayers cannot rely solely on foreign divorces without considering their state’s recognition of such decrees. Subsequent cases may need to similarly consider state law when addressing tax implications of marital status, particularly in cases involving potentially invalid foreign divorces.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.