Siewert v. Commissioner, 72 T. C. 326 (1979)

An unequal division of community property in a divorce settlement results in a taxable sale or exchange, requiring basis adjustment for the assets received.

Summary

In Siewert v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that the unequal division of community property between Courtney L. Siewert and his former wife Helen, as part of their divorce settlement, constituted a taxable sale or exchange rather than a nontaxable partition. The settlement allocated a significantly larger portion of the community assets to Mr. Siewert and included his agreement to pay Helen from non-community sources. The court rejected Mr. Siewert's claim for a refund based on a nontaxable division, ruling that he must adjust the basis of the assets he received to reflect the unequal division and payments made. Additionally, the court applied section 267(d) to nonrecognize any gain from subsequent sales of these assets due to the timing of the transaction with the divorce decree.

Facts

Courtney L. Siewert and Helen Siewert, married and residents of Texas, entered into a property settlement agreement on May 2, 1972, which was incorporated into their divorce decree on the same day. The agreement divided their community property, with Mr. Siewert receiving the majority, including the S Lazy S Ranch and various financial assets. Helen received the residence, a car, $200,000, and other smaller assets. Mr. Siewert also agreed to pay Helen's legal fees, assume all community debts, and make additional payments from his separate property, including a $100,000 loan and a $100,000 note payable in installments.

Procedural History

Mr. Siewert filed his 1972 Federal income tax return and later an amended return, claiming a refund based on a nontaxable division of community property. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency, and Mr. Siewert petitioned the Tax Court. The court held that the division was a taxable sale or exchange and applied section 267(d) to the subsequent sales of assets by Mr. Siewert in 1972.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the division of community property between Mr. Siewert and Helen under their divorce decree was a nontaxable partition or a taxable sale or exchange transaction.
2. If the division was a taxable sale or exchange, whether gain realized by Mr. Siewert on subsequent sales of certain property received pursuant to the divorce decree is nonrecognizable under section 267(d).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the division was not an approximately equal split of the community property. Mr. Siewert received substantially more than half the value of the community assets and agreed to make significant payments from his separate property to Helen, indicating a taxable sale or exchange.
2. Yes, because the sale or exchange occurred contemporaneously with the divorce, making section 267(d) applicable to nonrecognize any gain on the subsequent sales of the assets in 1972.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the transaction as a taxable sale or exchange due to the unequal division of the community property. It applied legal rules from prior cases, such as *Long v. Commissioner* and *Rouse v. Commissioner*, which established that an unequal division requires a basis adjustment. The court rejected Mr. Siewert's arguments about potential losses from the ranch and contingent liabilities, noting these were not directly payable to Helen and thus did not affect the basis calculation. Regarding section 267(d), the court found it applicable because the sale occurred simultaneously with the divorce, thus disallowing any gain recognition on subsequent sales of the assets due to the nonrecognition of Helen's loss.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of analyzing divorce settlements for tax implications, especially in community property states. Attorneys should advise clients that unequal divisions of community property can trigger taxable events requiring basis adjustments. The case also clarifies that section 267(d) can apply to transactions occurring at the time of divorce, affecting how gains from subsequent sales of such assets are treated for tax purposes. Practitioners must consider these factors in planning and executing divorce settlements to minimize tax liabilities. Later cases, such as *Deyoe v. Commissioner*, have cited Siewert in addressing similar issues of tax treatment in divorce-related property divisions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.