Furgatch v. Commissioner, 74 T. C. 1205 (1980)

Alimony payments made from community property are taxable to the extent they exceed the recipient's share of community income and assets.

Summary

In Furgatch v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed the taxation of alimony payments made from community property funds during a period of separation. The court held that Ronda Furgatch must include in her gross income the portion of support payments received from her husband that exceeded her interest in the community property. This ruling clarified that payments from community funds, whether current income or accumulated property, should be allocated first to the recipient's existing share of community assets, with the excess treated as taxable alimony under IRC § 71(a)(3). The decision underscores the need to avoid double taxation while ensuring that alimony derived from the payer's share of community property is properly taxed.

Facts

Ronda and Harvey Furgatch, married since 1954, separated and were subject to a California court order requiring Harvey to pay Ronda $625 monthly for spousal support, plus additional amounts to maintain her standard of living. These payments were made from a community account managed by Harvey, containing both current income and accumulated community property. From January to June 1973, Ronda received $29,377 for her support, while Harvey withdrew $18,244 for his living expenses. The couple filed separate tax returns, each reporting half of the current community income. Ronda argued that she should only be taxed on the excess payments after accounting for her husband's withdrawals, while the IRS contended she should be taxed on payments exceeding her community property interest.

Procedural History

The case originated with the IRS determining a deficiency in Ronda's 1973 income tax, leading her to petition the U. S. Tax Court. The court reviewed the case based on stipulated facts and ruled on the tax treatment of the alimony payments from community property.

Issue(s)

1. Whether periodic support payments made from community property funds are taxable to the recipient under IRC § 71(a)(3) to the extent they exceed the recipient's interest in the community property?

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found that support payments should be allocated first to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the recipient’s existing share of community property, with any excess treated as taxable alimony under IRC § 71(a)(3).

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that under California law applicable in 1973, both spouses had an equal interest in community property, managed by the husband. To avoid double taxation, the court followed its precedent in Hunt v. Commissioner, allocating payments first to the wife’s share of community income already taxed under IRC § 61. The excess, representing the husband’s share, was taxable as alimony. The court rejected Ronda’s argument to offset her husband’s withdrawals from the community account, stating that such adjustments are matters for the state court to handle upon final division of the community property. The court emphasized that the tax treatment should not depend on the husband’s expenditures but on the source and allocation of the payments made to the wife.

Practical Implications

This decision establishes a framework for taxing alimony from community property in community property states, requiring practitioners to carefully allocate payments between the recipient’s existing community property interest and taxable alimony. It highlights the importance of understanding state property laws in tax planning for divorcing couples. Practitioners should advise clients on the tax implications of support payments drawn from community funds and the potential for adjustments in the final property division. Subsequent cases have followed this ruling, reinforcing its application in similar situations. This case also underscores the need for clear agreements on the use of community funds during separation to avoid disputes over tax liabilities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.