Rusoff v. Commissioner, 65 T. C. 459 (1975)

A transfer to a charitable organization does not qualify as a charitable contribution if it is primarily motivated by the expectation of economic benefit.

Summary

In Rusoff v. Commissioner, the Tax Court held that a transfer of a cigarette filter invention to Columbia University did not constitute a charitable contribution under IRC § 170. The inventors, through a trust, transferred the invention to Columbia in exchange for a significant share of future royalties. The court found that the transaction was a business arrangement rather than a charitable act, as the primary motivation was economic gain. The court emphasized that a transfer motivated by anticipated economic benefits, even if made to a charity, does not qualify as a charitable contribution.

Facts

Robert Strickman developed a cigarette filter aimed at reducing tar and nicotine. He and other owners transferred their interests to a trust in June 1967, retaining rights to the trust's income and sale proceeds. The trust then assigned the invention to Columbia University in July 1967, under an agreement where Columbia would handle patent prosecution, licensing, and litigation, while the trust would receive a substantial percentage of royalties. The arrangement was terminated in February 1968 due to dissatisfaction with Columbia's efforts. The petitioners claimed charitable deductions on their 1967 tax returns, asserting they had donated half the invention's value to Columbia.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in the petitioners' income taxes for 1967 and subsequent years. The Tax Court consolidated the cases and severed the issue of the invention's value for separate trial. The court focused on whether the petitioners owned the invention at the time of transfer to Columbia and whether the transfer constituted a charitable contribution under IRC § 170.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioners owned any interest in the invention at the time it was transferred to Columbia University.
2. Whether the transfer of the invention to Columbia University constituted a charitable contribution within the meaning of IRC § 170.

Holding

1. Yes, because the trust to which the petitioners transferred the invention was a grantor trust under IRC § 677, entitling them to deductions for charitable

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

contributions made by the trust.
2. No, because the transaction with Columbia was a business arrangement motivated by economic benefit, not a charitable contribution under IRC § 170.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the legal principle that a charitable contribution must be a gift without consideration. It found that the transfer to Columbia was a business transaction rather than a charitable act, as evidenced by the expectation of substantial royalties and the trust's ability to terminate the agreement if Columbia failed to meet certain conditions. The court noted that the language of the assignment agreement used terms like "sell" and "compensation," indicating a quid pro quo. The court also considered the petitioners' motivations, concluding they sought economic benefits and credibility from Columbia's involvement. The court cited cases like DeJong v. Commissioner and Stubbs v. United States to support the principle that a transfer motivated by economic benefit is not a charitable contribution. The court rejected the petitioners' argument that the transaction was a bargain sale with a charitable element, finding no evidence of donative intent until after the termination notice was sent to Columbia.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that transfers to charitable organizations must be motivated by donative intent to qualify as charitable contributions under IRC § 170. Attorneys should advise clients that arrangements with charities that involve significant economic benefits to the donor, such as royalty-sharing agreements, are likely to be treated as business transactions rather than charitable contributions. This ruling may impact how inventors and other property owners structure their dealings with charities, emphasizing the need for clear documentation of charitable intent. The case also illustrates the importance of consistent legal documentation in tax planning, as the court relied heavily on the language of the trust and assignment agreements. Subsequent cases like Singer Co. v. United States have further developed the principle that economic benefits negate charitable contribution status.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.