Estate of Rolin v. Commissioner, 68 T. C. 919 (1977)

A decedent's executor can effectively renounce the decedent's interest in an inter vivos trust within a reasonable time after the interest becomes fixed.

Summary

In Estate of Rolin v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed the validity of a post-death renunciation of a trust interest by the decedent's executors. Genevieve Rolin's husband created a revocable trust, which upon his death split into two trusts. The court held that the executors' renunciation of Rolin's interest in the marital trust (Trust A) was effective under New York law, thus excluding its value from her estate. Additionally, the court determined that Rolin did not possess a general power of appointment over the assets of the non-marital trust (Trust B), hence those assets were also not includable in her estate. The decision underscores the significance of timing and the nature of powers in trusts for estate tax purposes.

Facts

Daniel H. Rolin created a revocable trust in 1958, retaining the income for life and the power to revoke. Upon his death in 1968, the trust was to be divided into Trust A (marital trust) and Trust B (non-marital trust). Genevieve Rolin, his wife, was to receive the income from both trusts for life and had a general power of appointment over Trust A's principal. After Genevieve's death in 1969, her executors renounced her interest in Trust A, aiming to exclude its value from her estate. The trust agreement allowed for such renunciation within 14 months of Daniel's death. Genevieve's will also empowered her executors to renounce such interests. The executors renounced within 8 months of Daniel's death and 15 days after their appointment.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Genevieve Rolin's estate tax, arguing that the value of both Trust A and Trust B should be included in her estate due to her powers over these trusts. The Estate of Rolin challenged this determination before the U. S. Tax Court, which then ruled on the validity of the renunciation and the nature of Genevieve's powers over Trust B.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the renunciation by Genevieve Rolin's executors of her interest in Trust A was effective to exclude the value of Trust A from her taxable estate.
2. Whether Genevieve Rolin had a general power of appointment over the assets of Trust B, requiring their inclusion in her taxable estate.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because under New York law, the executors' renunciation was valid and made within a reasonable time after Genevieve's interest in Trust A became fixed upon her husband's death.
2. No, because Genevieve's administrative powers over Trust B did not constitute a general power of appointment, as they were subject to fiduciary duties and restrictions on self-benefit.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that under New York law, a beneficiary's executor can renounce a trust interest if the beneficiary did not accept it during their lifetime. The court found that Genevieve never accepted her interest in Trust A, as she did not receive income or exercise her power to withdraw principal. The renunciation was timely, occurring within 8 months of Daniel's death, which was considered reasonable since Genevieve's interest was not fixed until his death. The court also clarified that the same principles apply to inter vivos trusts as to testamentary trusts regarding renunciation.

Regarding Trust B, the court rejected the Commissioner's argument that Genevieve's administrative powers constituted a general power of appointment. The court noted that New York law imposes fiduciary duties even on powers granted in an individual capacity, and the trust agreement explicitly prohibited any trustee from paying principal to themselves. The court cited precedents to support that such powers, bound by fiduciary duty, do not constitute a general power of appointment.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how executors handle trust interests post-mortem, emphasizing the importance of timely renunciation to avoid estate tax inclusion. It clarifies that under New York law, executors can renounce inter vivos trust interests if the decedent did not accept them during their lifetime. The ruling also reinforces that fiduciary duties limit what might otherwise be considered broad administrative powers, affecting how trusts are structured and administered to avoid unintended tax consequences. Later cases have cited Rolin in discussions about the validity of renunciations and the characterization of powers in trusts for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.