Estate of Leonidas C. Papson, Deceased, Costa L. Papson, Executor, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 73 T. C. 290 (1979)

Brokerage commissions incurred by an estate to lease a major asset are deductible as administration expenses if necessary to preserve the estate's value and facilitate tax payment.

Summary

In Estate of Papson, the Tax Court ruled that a brokerage commission paid to secure a new tenant for a shopping center, which constituted over 35% of the estate's value, was deductible as an administration expense under IRC § 2053(a)(2). The court found that the commission was necessary to maintain the estate's value and enable payment of estate taxes under the installment method of IRC § 6166. This decision underscores that expenses incurred to preserve an estate's income-generating capacity can be considered essential to settling the estate, even if they also benefit the beneficiaries.

Facts

Leonidas C. Papson died in 1973, owning a shopping center that represented over 35% of his gross estate. The estate elected to pay estate taxes under IRC § 6166. In 1976, the primary tenant, W. T. Grant Co. , vacated due to bankruptcy. The executor, Costa L. Papson, engaged a broker to find a replacement tenant, incurring a commission of $109,708. 95 when F. W. Woolworth Co. signed a long-term lease.

Procedural History

The executor filed a federal estate tax return in 1974 and later claimed the brokerage commission as a deductible administration expense. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction, leading to a deficiency notice. The case proceeded to the U. S. Tax Court, which held a trial and issued its opinion in 1979.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the brokerage commission paid to lease the shopping center space qualifies as an administration expense under IRC § 2053(a)(2).

Holding

1. Yes, because the commission was necessary to preserve the estate's value and facilitate payment of estate taxes under IRC § 6166.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied IRC § 2053(a)(2) and the related regulations, focusing on whether

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the commission was necessary for the proper settlement of the estate. It noted that the shopping center was the estate's primary asset and crucial for paying estate taxes under the installment method. The court rejected the Commissioner's arguments that the expense benefited the beneficiaries rather than the estate, emphasizing that the executor's actions were essential to maintain the estate's income stream and avoid a forced sale or foreclosure. The court also found that the will granted the executor broad powers to manage the estate, including leasing the property. It distinguished this case from others where commissions were not necessary for estate settlement, highlighting the unique circumstances of the large asset and sudden tenant vacancy. The court cited New York law and prior cases to support its view that the commission was properly deductible.

Practical Implications

This decision allows estates to deduct brokerage commissions as administration expenses when necessary to preserve a major income-generating asset, particularly in cases where the estate has elected deferred payment of taxes under IRC § 6166. It emphasizes the importance of maintaining an estate's income stream to facilitate tax payment, even if the expenses also benefit beneficiaries. Practitioners should consider this ruling when advising estates with significant business interests, as it may impact estate planning and tax strategies. The case has been cited in later decisions involving similar issues, reinforcing the principle that necessary expenses to preserve estate value can be deductible, even if they extend beyond the administration period.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.