Estate of Edward E. Hoenig, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York and Samuel S. Zuckerberg, Executors, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 66 T. C. 471 (1976)

A legacy disclaimed by a decedent's executor within a reasonable time after the decedent's death is not includable in the decedent's gross estate for federal estate tax purposes if valid under state law.

Summary

Edward Hoenig's wife, Ethel, died 11 days before him, leaving him a legacy. After Edward's death, his executors disclaimed this legacy. The issue was whether this posthumous disclaimer excluded the legacy from Edward's taxable estate. The Tax Court held that the disclaimer was valid under New York law and was executed within a reasonable time, thus not includable in the gross estate. This ruling underscores the importance of timely and valid disclaimers in estate planning and their recognition under federal tax law when compliant with state law.

Facts

Ethel G. Hoenig died on April 25, 1970, leaving a legacy to her husband Edward E. Hoenig, who died 11 days later on May 6, 1970. Edward's will, probated on June 3, 1970, included a provision to pass on any inheritance from Ethel to their daughter, Jeanne. On May 2, 1970, it was decided that Edward should disclaim Ethel's legacy, but he was unable to sign the disclaimer before his death. On August 10, 1970, Edward's executors formally disclaimed the legacy after obtaining Jeanne's consent. No distributions from Ethel's estate were made to Edward or his estate.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Edward's estate tax, asserting that the disclaimed legacy should be included in his gross estate. Edward's estate filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court, which subsequently ruled in favor of the estate, holding that the disclaimer was valid under New York law and timely under federal standards.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a legacy disclaimed by a decedent's executor after the decedent's death is includable in the decedent's gross estate for federal estate tax purposes.

Holding

1. No, because the disclaimer was valid under New York law and executed within a reasonable time after the decedent's death, thus not includable in the gross estate for federal estate tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied New York common law, which allows an executor to disclaim a legacy on behalf of a deceased legatee, as supported by the decision in *In Re Klosk’s Estate*. The court found that Edward’s executors disclaimed the legacy within a reasonable time, as neither Edward nor his estate had accepted any distributions or exercised control over the legacy. The court emphasized that the disclaimer was not part of a tax avoidance scheme but was consistent with Edward’s and Ethel’s intent to benefit their daughter Jeanne. The court also cited federal precedents like *Brown v. Routzahn* and *First National Bank of Montgomery v. United States* to support its stance on the timeliness and effectiveness of the disclaimer for federal tax purposes.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that executors can disclaim legacies on behalf of a deceased legatee if done promptly and in compliance with state law, affecting how estates are planned and administered to minimize tax liabilities. It impacts estate planning by affirming that post-mortem disclaimers can be valid for tax purposes, allowing for more flexible estate planning strategies. For legal practitioners, this case emphasizes the need to understand both state disclaimer laws and federal tax implications. Subsequent cases, such as *Estate of Schloessinger* and *Estate of Cooper*, have distinguished this ruling based on the enactment of specific state statutes governing disclaimers.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.