Estate of Theodore E. Beauregard, Jr. , Deceased, Theodore E. Beauregard III and Yvonne Marie B. Beauregard, Special Administrators, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 74 T. C. 603 (1980)

A court order can divest an insured of incidents of ownership in a life insurance policy, making its proceeds excludable from the insured's gross estate under section 2042(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

Theodore Beauregard Jr. died in a work-related accident covered by his employer's travel insurance policy. The policy allowed Beauregard to designate beneficiaries and elect payment modes. However, a divorce decree required him to maintain his minor children as beneficiaries of any group accident policy. The Tax Court held that under California law, this court order effectively divested Beauregard of any incidents of ownership in the policy at his death, so the proceeds were not includable in his estate. This case illustrates that court orders can override policy terms, impacting estate tax calculations.

Facts

Theodore Beauregard Jr. was employed by Hazeltine Corp. and covered under its travel accident insurance policy. The policy allowed Beauregard to designate beneficiaries and choose between lump-sum or installment payments. Beauregard's divorce decree required him to maintain his minor children as beneficiaries of any group accident policy. Beauregard died in a work-related accident, and the insurance proceeds were paid to his children. The estate argued the proceeds should not be included in Beauregard's gross estate due to the divorce decree's effect on his ownership rights.

Procedural History

The estate filed a tax return excluding the insurance proceeds from Beauregard's gross estate. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency, arguing the proceeds should be included. The estate petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which held that the divorce decree divested Beauregard of incidents of ownership, so the proceeds were not includable in his estate.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the court order requiring Beauregard to maintain his minor children as beneficiaries of the policy divested him of incidents of ownership under section 2042(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because under California law, the court order effectively divested

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Beauregard of all incidents of ownership in the policy at his death, making the proceeds excludable from his gross estate.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court applied California law to determine that the divorce decree's requirement to maintain the children as beneficiaries effectively nullified Beauregard's rights under the policy. The court relied on *Reliance Life Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh v. Jaffe*, which held that a property settlement agreement can vest an equitable interest in policy proceeds in third-party beneficiaries, precluding the insured from changing the beneficiary. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that Beauregard retained residual rights to designate contingent beneficiaries or elect payment modes, as any attempt to exercise these rights would have violated the court order. The court emphasized that Beauregard's rights must be evaluated at the time of death, not based on hypothetical future scenarios.

Practical Implications

This decision highlights the importance of considering state law and court orders when analyzing incidents of ownership in insurance policies for estate tax purposes. Attorneys should advise clients that a court order can override policy terms, potentially excluding proceeds from the estate. This case may impact how insurance policies are structured in divorce settlements and how estates plan to minimize tax liabilities. Subsequent cases, such as *Morton v. United States*, have followed this reasoning, reinforcing its significance in estate planning and tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.