Estate of Greenberg v. Commissioner, 76 T. C. 680 (1981); 1981 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 137

A claim against an estate, valid at the time of death but disputed post-mortem, is deductible for federal estate tax if settled with approval from all adverse parties and the probate court.

Summary

The Estate of Greenberg case addressed the deductibility of debts owed to Bank of America by the decedent, Mayer C. Greenberg, under federal estate tax law. Greenberg's estate contested the bank's claim due to late filing, leading to a settlement approved by all estate beneficiaries and the probate court. The U. S. Tax Court held that the claim was deductible, emphasizing the validity of the debt at Greenberg's death and the settlement's legitimacy. The court's decision reinforced the importance of considering post-death events and the enforceability of claims under state law when determining federal estate tax deductions.

Facts

Mayer C. Greenberg died on August 15, 1974, owing Bank of America $428,014 in debts, valid at his death. The bank filed its claim against Greenberg's estate after the statutory four-month period, which the estate executor, Daniel B. Greenberg, rejected. The bank then initiated legal action to enforce the claim. Before a final court decision, the estate and the bank settled, reducing interest rates and extending payment terms. All beneficiaries, represented by independent counsel, and the probate court approved the settlement. The estate sought to deduct these debts on its federal estate tax return, which the IRS disallowed, leading to the dispute before the U. S. Tax Court.

Procedural History

The estate filed its federal estate tax return on November 19, 1975, claiming deductions for the debts owed to Bank of America. The IRS disallowed these deductions in 1978, asserting that the debts became unenforceable post-mortem. The estate petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for relief, leading to the court's decision on April 27, 1981.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the debts owed to Bank of America, which were valid at the time of Greenberg's death but disputed post-mortem, are deductible as claims against the estate under section 2053(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the debts were valid at Greenberg's death, and despite the late filing

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

of the claim, the settlement, approved by all adverse parties and the probate court, was a bona fide recognition of the claim's validity under California law, making them deductible for federal estate tax purposes.

Court's Reasoning

The court's decision hinged on the validity of the debts at Greenberg's death and the subsequent settlement's legitimacy. The court noted that events occurring after death are relevant to claim deductibility. It applied IRS regulations that accept a local court's decision on claim allowability if the court considered the facts upon which deductibility depends. The court presumed the settlement's validity because all adverse parties consented, and it was approved by the probate court. It considered the bank's argument of estoppel due to alleged misrepresentation by the executor, which could have excused the late filing under California law. The court declined to decide state law factual issues, instead assuming the bank's factual allegations were true, and ruled that doubts about state law should favor the debts' enforceability. The court also rejected the IRS's contention that the settlement was not bona fide, citing the probate court's approval and the executor's efforts to avoid conflicts of interest.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that a claim against an estate, valid at the time of the decedent's death, remains deductible for federal estate tax even if contested post-mortem, provided it is settled with the approval of all adverse parties and the probate court. Practitioners should be aware that executors may settle disputed claims without risking the loss of federal estate tax deductions, as long as the settlement is bona fide and not a mere cloak for a gift. The decision underscores the importance of state law in determining the enforceability of claims and reinforces the need for executors to carefully manage and document settlement negotiations. Subsequent cases have cited Greenberg to support the deductibility of settled claims, emphasizing the need for genuine disputes and proper court approval.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.