Estate of Shelton v. Commissioner, 68 T.C. 15 (1977)

Income from Osage headright shares is taxable to unrestricted Osage Indians, and interest income from a tax refund is constructively received in the year it is made available, even with administrative conditions for disbursement.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed two tax issues for the Estate of Jacqueline E. Shelton, a deceased unrestricted Osage Indian. First, the court determined whether income from Osage headright shares, representing mineral trust interests, was taxable to her estate. Second, it considered whether interest from a tax refund, inherited by Shelton from her mother's estate, was taxable in 1970 under the constructive receipt doctrine. The court held that headright income for unrestricted Osage Indians is taxable, citing precedent and statutory interpretation. Regarding the refund interest, the court found it was constructively received in 1970 when the agency made it available, despite administrative requirements for disbursement, making the interest taxable to Shelton's estate in that year.

Facts

Jacqueline E. Shelton, an unrestricted Osage Indian, died in 1967, owning headright shares in the Osage tribal mineral trust. These headrights originated from her mother, Mary Jacqueline Elkins, a restricted Osage Indian. As an unrestricted Osage, Shelton received quarterly payments from the mineral trust. After initially including headright income in tax returns for 1968 and 1969, Shelton's estate sought a refund, arguing this income was non-taxable. Separately, Shelton's estate was the beneficiary of a tax refund due to her mother's estate from overpaid estate taxes in 1936. The IRS issued this refund in 1970, crediting it to Elkins' estate account at the Osage Indian Agency, but required an additional bond before disbursement to Shelton's estate. Legal fees related to obtaining the refund were also in dispute, leading to a portion of the refund being withheld by the agency.

Procedural History

The IRS determined tax deficiencies for Shelton's estate for 1968-1970, including headright income and refund interest. Shelton's estate petitioned the Tax Court, contesting these deficiencies. The Tax Court consolidated the issues of headright income taxability and the taxability year for the refund interest in this proceeding.

Issue(s)

1. Whether income derived from Osage headright shares, received by the estate of an unrestricted Osage Indian, is includable in the estate's gross income for federal income tax purposes.
2. Whether the interest portion of a tax refund, inherited by the estate and made available by the Osage Indian Agency in 1970, was constructively received by

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the estate in 1970, making it taxable in that year.

Holding

1. Yes, because the Osage Allotment Act, even liberally construed, does not exempt headright income of unrestricted Osage Indians from federal income tax, and Supreme Court precedent in *Choteau v. Burnet* supports the taxability of such income for unrestricted Indians.
2. Yes, because the interest from the tax refund was constructively received in 1970. The funds were made available to the estate by the agency, and the requirement of posting an additional bond was not considered a substantial restriction preventing constructive receipt.

Court's Reasoning

Issue 1 (Headright Income): The court relied on *Choteau v. Burnet*, which established that headright income for unrestricted Osage Indians is taxable. The court distinguished *Squire v. Capoeman* and *Big Eagle v. United States*, which exempted income for restricted Indians, noting those cases aimed to support Indians until they reached competency. Shelton, being unrestricted, was deemed to have achieved competency, thus the rationale for exemption did not apply. The court emphasized that "None of the amendments to the Osage Allotment Act have placed any restrictions whatsoever on the use of the income received by an unrestricted Osage Indian from his headright shares." The court also quoted *Choteau*: "It is evident that as respects his property other than his homestead his status is not different from that of any citizen of the United States…with respect to the income in question, fully emancipated."

Issue 2 (Constructive Receipt): The court applied the constructive receipt doctrine, stating income is received when "credited to his account, set apart for him, or otherwise made available so that he may draw upon it during the taxable year." The court found the refund was "set apart" in 1970 when credited to the Elkins estate account, of which Shelton's estate was the sole beneficiary. The bond requirement was not a "substantial limitation" because the estate could obtain it at will. The court reasoned, "Therefore, we must conclude that the time at which the bond requirement would be satisfied was within petitioner's complete control." The court also dismissed the argument that requiring payment to the Oklahoma ancillary estate was a substantial restriction, as the estate had no legal right to demand payment through the Kansas domiciliary estate, citing Oklahoma probate jurisdiction over Osage Indian property.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that income from Osage headrights is taxable for unrestricted Osage Indians, reinforcing the principle from *Choteau v. Burnet*. It highlights the distinction between restricted and unrestricted Native Americans regarding tax

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

exemptions on trust income. For estate administration, it underscores that even inherited trust income retains its taxable character. Regarding constructive receipt, the case demonstrates that administrative conditions, like posting a bond, do not necessarily prevent constructive receipt if the taxpayer has ultimate control over fulfilling those conditions. This case serves as a reminder that the constructive receipt doctrine is applied based on control and availability, not just physical possession, impacting tax planning for estates and trusts, particularly when dealing with agency-managed funds and administrative prerequisites for disbursement.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.