Estate of Peter Orphanos, Deceased, and First Security National Bank & Trust Co. , Executor, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 67 T. C. 780 (1977)

A charitable deduction can be granted under section 2055 even if the will does not explicitly state the recipient of the charitable bequest, provided the testator's intent for a charitable purpose can be clearly established.

Summary

In Estate of Orphanos v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court upheld a charitable deduction for a trust established to build a hospital in Kerasitsa, Greece. Peter Orphanos's will directed the trust to accumulate funds from property rentals to construct the hospital, but did not specify who would own it afterward. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction, arguing the hospital would pass to Orphanos's heirs. The court, applying Kentucky law, found that Orphanos intended the hospital for the village's benefit, not his heirs, and thus allowed the deduction, emphasizing the testator's intent over the absence of an explicit beneficiary.

Facts

Peter Orphanos died testate on December 22, 1971, leaving a will dated January 6, 1968. The will established a trust with funds from rental properties in Kentucky, to be used to build a hospital in Kerasitsa, Greece, named "Peter Orphanos Hospital. " Upon completion, the trust was to terminate, and the properties sold to equip the hospital. No further instructions were provided regarding the hospital's ownership after the trust's termination. The estate claimed a charitable deduction for the trust, which the Commissioner disallowed, asserting that the hospital would pass to Orphanos's heirs by intestacy.

Procedural History

The estate filed a timely estate tax return claiming a charitable deduction for the hospital trust. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction, leading to the estate's appeal to the U. S. Tax Court. The court heard the case and ruled in favor of the estate, allowing the charitable deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a charitable deduction under section 2055 can be granted when a will does not explicitly designate the recipient of the charitable bequest, but the testator's intent for a charitable purpose can be clearly established.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found that the testator's intent to benefit the village of Kerasitsa by constructing a hospital was clear, and under Kentucky law, such intent

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

was sufficient to vest title in the village or its representative, thus qualifying for a charitable deduction.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Kentucky's cardinal rule of will construction, which prioritizes the testator's intent. It analyzed the entire will, noting specific bequests to family members and the absence of any indication that the hospital was intended for these heirs. The court determined that Orphanos intended to benefit Kerasitsa by building a hospital named after himself, which aligned with the charitable purpose of section 2055. The court cited *Penick v. Thom's Trustee*, which held that a charitable bequest should not fail for lack of a designated trustee or title holder if the testator's charitable intent is clear. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that the hospital would pass to heirs by intestacy, emphasizing that Kentucky law favors absolute estates and looks askance at partial intestacy.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of determining the testator's intent in ambiguous bequests for tax purposes. It suggests that attorneys should carefully draft wills to clearly articulate charitable intent, even if specific beneficiaries are not named. For similar cases, courts may look beyond the text of the will to the testator's overall purpose, potentially broadening the scope of charitable deductions. This ruling may encourage the creation of charitable trusts where the intent to benefit a community or cause is evident, even without detailed instructions on asset distribution post-trust termination. Later cases may reference Orphanos to support the validity of charitable deductions where the testator's intent is clear but the recipient is not explicitly named.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.