Estate of Olive Ruth Swenson v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1976-309

Under Texas law, a surviving spouse's disclaimer of a bequest in a will is treated as if the spouse predeceased the decedent, causing the estate to pass to contingent beneficiaries named in the will, thus disqualifying the estate for a marital deduction.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether a marital deduction was permissible when the surviving spouse disclaimed his interest in the decedent's residuary estate. Olive Ruth Swenson's will bequeathed her residuary estate to her husband, W.G. Swenson, Jr., but provided for her daughters as contingent beneficiaries if her husband predeceased her or died within 30 days. Swenson disclaimed his interest. The court held that under Texas law, the disclaimer caused the residuary estate to pass directly to the daughters as contingent beneficiaries, not through intestate succession. Consequently, no property interest passed to the surviving spouse for marital deduction purposes under federal estate tax law.

Facts

Olive Ruth Swenson died testate in Texas, survived by her husband, W.G. Swenson, Jr., and two daughters. Her will bequeathed her residuary estate to her husband, but if he predeceased her or died within 30 days, it would go to her daughters. W.G. Swenson, Jr., survived her by more than 30 days but filed a disclaimer of his interest in the residuary estate. The estate claimed a marital deduction on the federal estate tax return, which the IRS disallowed, arguing that no property passed to the surviving spouse due to the disclaimer.

Procedural History

The Estate of Olive Ruth Swenson petitioned the Tax Court to contest the IRS's deficiency determination. The IRS disallowed a portion of the marital deduction claimed by the estate. The case was submitted to the Tax Court fully stipulated, meaning both parties agreed on the facts, and the court needed to decide the legal issue.

Issue(s)

1. Whether, under Texas law, the disclaimer by W.G. Swenson, Jr., caused the residuary estate to pass as if Olive Ruth Swenson died intestate with respect to that property.
2. If the residuary estate passes as if intestate, whether a portion passing to the surviving spouse under Texas intestacy law qualifies for the marital deduction.
3. Alternatively, whether the disclaimer caused the residuary estate to pass directly to the contingent beneficiaries (the daughters) as provided in the will, thereby precluding a marital deduction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because under Texas law, the disclaimer is treated as if the disclaiming beneficiary predeceased the testator, and the will provided for contingent beneficiaries.
2. Not applicable, because the estate did not pass via intestacy to the surviving spouse due to the disclaimer's effect.
3. Yes, because the disclaimer activated the contingent bequest to the daughters, and therefore no qualifying interest in property passed to the surviving spouse for marital deduction purposes.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the effect of the disclaimer is determined by Texas law. In the absence of specific Texas Supreme Court precedent, the Tax Court had to predict how the Texas Supreme Court would rule. The court analyzed the will, emphasizing the testator's intent to dispose of her entire estate through the will. Article VIII of the will clearly provided for the daughters to inherit if the husband did not take. The court interpreted the disclaimer as triggering this alternative provision, effectively treating Swenson as if he had predeceased his wife concerning the residuary bequest. The court stated, "We believe the correct treatment of a disclaimer is that accorded it in the recently enacted section 37A of the Texas Probate Code, i.e., to treat the disclaimant as having predeceased the decedent… and that the Supreme Court of Texas would so conclude." The court rejected the estate's argument that the disclaimer caused intestacy for the residuary estate, finding that this would disrupt the testator's clear testamentary plan. The court concluded that because the property passed directly to the daughters due to the disclaimer and the will's terms, no interest passed to the surviving spouse that would qualify for the marital deduction under section 2056(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that a surviving spouse's disclaimer, particularly in states like Texas, can significantly impact estate tax marital deductions. It highlights the importance of clear contingent beneficiary designations in wills. For estate planning, this case underscores that if a will provides for contingent beneficiaries in the event a primary beneficiary does not take, a disclaimer by the primary beneficiary will likely cause the property to pass to the contingent beneficiaries, preventing the disclaimed property from qualifying for the marital deduction. Legal practitioners should advise clients that disclaimers, while useful for post-mortem estate planning, must be carefully considered in light of both state law and the testator's overall estate plan to avoid unintended tax consequences, especially regarding the marital deduction. This case emphasizes that courts will strive to uphold the testator's intent as expressed in the will and that disclaimers will be interpreted within that framework.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.