Grutman v. Commissioner, 80 T. C. 464 (1983)

Cooperative apartment rent payments made by an ex-husband to secure his ex-wife's occupancy are alimony income to her, except for portions attributable to mortgage interest, real estate taxes, and mortgage principal amortization.

Summary

In Grutman v. Commissioner, the court ruled that rent payments made by Doriane Grutman's ex-husband to a cooperative apartment corporation were alimony income to Doriane, less amounts attributable to mortgage interest, real estate taxes, and mortgage principal amortization. The ex-husband owned the cooperative shares, and under their separation agreement, he was required to make these payments while Doriane occupied the apartment. The court's decision hinged on the principle that payments directly benefiting the ex-wife were alimony, while those yielding a direct tax benefit to the ex-husband were not. This ruling clarifies the tax treatment of cooperative housing expenses in divorce situations and underscores the importance of the separation agreement's terms in determining alimony.

Facts

Doriane Grutman's ex-husband, Norman Grutman, purchased shares in a cooperative housing corporation in 1967, entitling him to lease an apartment. Following their divorce in 1975, their separation agreement allowed Doriane to occupy the apartment until certain conditions were met. Norman was obligated to pay the cooperative's monthly rent and assessments during Doriane's occupancy. In 1976, Norman paid $10,812. 48 in rent, of which portions were allocated to mortgage interest, real estate taxes, and mortgage principal amortization. Doriane did not report these payments as income on her 1976 tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Doriane's 1976 federal income tax, asserting that the cooperative rent payments constituted alimony income to her. Doriane challenged this determination in the United States Tax Court, which heard the case and issued its opinion on February 23, 1983.

Issue(s)

1. Whether cooperative rent payments made by an ex-husband to a cooperative corporation are alimony income to the ex-wife under section 71(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether such payments are considered made "because of the marital or family relationship. "

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the payments directly and more than incidentally benefited the ex-wife by securing her occupancy of the apartment, except for portions allocable to mortgage interest, real estate taxes, and mortgage principal amortization, which directly benefited the ex-husband.
2. Yes, because the obligation to make these payments was imposed by the separation agreement, thus satisfying the requirement that payments be made "because of the marital or family relationship. "

Court's Reasoning

The court applied section 71(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, which defines alimony as periodic payments made under a written separation agreement because of the marital or family relationship. The court recognized that while the cooperative's corporate status must be respected, payments that directly and more than incidentally benefit the ex-wife constitute alimony. The court distinguished between payments that directly benefit the ex-husband (such as those allocable to mortgage interest, real estate taxes, and mortgage principal amortization, which increase his tax benefits) and those that primarily benefit the ex-wife (securing her occupancy). The court rejected Doriane's argument that the payments were made primarily for Norman's investment or to keep their children near him, finding that the primary purpose was to provide shelter for Doriane and the children. The court also noted that the separation agreement's terms requiring increased support payments if Doriane vacated the apartment indicated the financial benefit conferred upon her by the rent payments.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how cooperative apartment rent payments are treated in divorce situations. Attorneys should carefully draft separation agreements to specify how such payments are to be treated for tax purposes. For similar cases, the ruling suggests that payments securing an ex-spouse's occupancy in a cooperative apartment are likely to be considered alimony, except for portions yielding a direct tax benefit to the paying spouse. This may influence how divorcing parties negotiate housing arrangements and alimony terms. The decision also has implications for cooperative housing corporations, as it clarifies that their corporate status is respected for tax purposes. Later cases, such as Rothschild v. Commissioner, have followed this ruling, reinforcing its application in similar circumstances.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.