Deyoe v. Commissioner, 66 T. C. 904 (1976)

Gains from the sale of depreciable property between spouses, even in the context of a pending divorce, are treated as ordinary income under IRC section 1239.

Summary

In Deyoe v. Commissioner, Elizabeth Deyoe sold her community interest in a ranch to her husband, George Deyoe, as part of a property settlement during their divorce proceedings. The sale occurred on May 21, 1969, before the final divorce decree was entered. The key issue was whether the gain from this sale, involving depreciable property, should be treated as ordinary income under IRC section 1239. The U. S. Tax Court held that the sale was complete on the date of the oral agreement and that the parties were still legally married at that time, thus subjecting the gain to ordinary income treatment. This decision emphasizes the importance of the timing of property transfers in marital dissolutions and the application of tax laws to such transactions.

Facts

Elizabeth Deyoe and George Deyoe, who were married in 1938, separated in July 1968, and George filed for divorce in the same month. On May 21, 1969, they reached an oral agreement for the division of their community property, which included Elizabeth selling her interest in their ranch to George for $175,000. This agreement was later memorialized in a written document executed on June 18, 1969. Elizabeth moved off the ranch on June 5, 1969, and George assumed its operation and liabilities. An interlocutory divorce decree was granted on July 31, 1969, and a final decree on August 6, 1969. Elizabeth reported the sale as a long-term capital gain on her tax returns, but the IRS determined that the gain attributable to depreciable property should be treated as ordinary income under IRC section 1239.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a deficiency notice to Elizabeth Deyoe for the tax years 1969 and 1970, asserting that the gain from the sale of the ranch should be treated as ordinary income. Elizabeth contested this determination and petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court held that the sale was complete on May 21, 1969, before the divorce was finalized, and that the gain from the sale of depreciable property was ordinary income under IRC section 1239.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the sale of Elizabeth Deyoe’s interest in the ranch to her husband, George Deyoe, was complete on May 21, 1969, before the final divorce decree was entered.
2. Whether Elizabeth and George Deyoe were “husband and wife” within the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

meaning of IRC section 1239 at the time of the sale.
3. Whether IRC section 1239 applies to a sale arising out of the dissolution of a marriage.

Holding

1. Yes, because the oral agreement on May 21, 1969, constituted a present sale and conveyance, and the parties intended to transfer the benefits and burdens of ownership on that date.
2. Yes, because under California law, they remained husband and wife until the final divorce decree was entered on August 6, 1969.
3. Yes, because the language of IRC section 1239 is unambiguous and does not provide an exception for sales arising out of a marital dissolution.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court applied a practical test to determine the date of the sale, considering all facts and circumstances, including the transfer of legal title and the shift of benefits and burdens of ownership. The court found that the parties intended to transfer ownership on May 21, 1969, as evidenced by the oral agreement, the subsequent written agreement, and the actions of the parties, such as George assuming the ranch's liabilities and Elizabeth moving off the property. The court also noted that California law allows spouses to settle property rights by contract, and the agreement was not conditioned on the final divorce decree. Regarding the marital status, the court relied on California law, which considers parties to be husband and wife until the final divorce decree is entered. The court rejected Elizabeth's argument that IRC section 1239 should not apply to sales arising out of a marital dissolution, citing the unambiguous language of the statute and the lack of any statutory exception for such cases. The court also noted that the legislative history of IRC section 1239 did not support Elizabeth's contentions.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for property settlements in divorce proceedings. It underscores the importance of the timing of property transfers and the potential tax consequences of such transactions. Attorneys and parties involved in divorce proceedings should carefully consider the tax implications of property settlements, particularly when depreciable property is involved. The decision also highlights the need to clearly document the terms of any property settlement agreement, including the effective date of any transfers, to avoid unintended tax consequences. In subsequent cases, courts have applied this ruling to similar situations, emphasizing the need for parties to be aware of the tax implications of property transfers during divorce proceedings. This case serves as a reminder that tax laws can have a significant impact on the division of property in divorce settlements and that parties should seek competent tax advice to ensure compliance with applicable tax provisions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.