Estate of Josephine O'Meara Dancy, Deceased, John J. Peck, Executor, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 89 T. C. 550 (1987)

For Federal estate tax purposes, disclaimers of joint tenancy interests must be valid under applicable state law unless they meet the specific requirements of IRC § 2518(c)(3).

Summary

The Estate of Josephine O'Meara Dancy attempted to disclaim her survivorship interest in jointly owned property with her late husband under North Carolina law. The Tax Court held that the disclaimers were invalid for Federal estate tax purposes because they did not comply with North Carolina law. Additionally, the disclaimers did not meet the criteria under IRC § 2518(c)(3) to bypass state law requirements, as they failed to transfer the interest to a named person who would have received it had a qualified disclaimer been made. This ruling underscores the importance of adhering to state law for disclaimers unless specific federal provisions are met.

Facts

Josephine O'Meara Dancy died eight days after her husband, John Spencer Dancy. They jointly owned various assets, including stocks, bonds, certificates of deposit, and a money market account. After her husband's death, Dancy's executor attempted to disclaim her survivorship interest in these assets by filing a "Statement of Renunciation. " This disclaimer was not made in accordance with North Carolina law, which does not allow for the disclaimer of property acquired by operation of law without specific statutory authority.

Procedural History

The estate filed a Federal estate tax return excluding the disclaimed interests. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency, leading the estate to petition the Tax Court. The court examined the validity of the disclaimers under both North Carolina law and the Internal Revenue Code, ultimately ruling in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the disclaimers of Dancy's survivorship interest in the joint assets were valid under North Carolina law for Federal estate tax purposes.
2. Whether the disclaimers qualified under IRC § 2518(c)(3), allowing them to avoid the requirements of state law.

Holding

1. No, because the disclaimers were invalid under North Carolina law, which does

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

not permit disclaimers of survivorship interests without specific statutory authorization.
2. No, because the disclaimers did not meet the requirements of IRC § 2518(c)(3), as they failed to transfer the interest to a named person who would have received it had a qualified disclaimer been made.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed that under North Carolina law, the right to disclaim property acquired by operation of law, such as survivorship interests, requires specific statutory authorization, which was absent in this case. The court noted, "We must determine, as best we can, what the highest court of North Carolina would hold on the question of State law which is presented. " The court also examined IRC § 2518(c)(3), which allows for disclaimers without regard to state law if the interest is transferred in writing to a person who would have received it under a qualified disclaimer. The court determined that the disclaimers in this case did not meet this requirement because the "Statement of Renunciation" did not transfer the interest to any named person, thus failing to comply with the federal statute.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the necessity of ensuring that disclaimers of joint tenancy interests comply with state law unless they meet the specific criteria of IRC § 2518(c)(3). Attorneys should carefully draft disclaimers to include a transfer to a named person when attempting to bypass state law requirements. The decision impacts estate planning strategies, particularly in states without comprehensive disclaimer statutes, and underscores the need for clear legislative guidance to avoid discrepancies between state and federal tax treatment of disclaimers. Subsequent cases have referenced this decision when addressing the validity of disclaimers under varying state laws and federal tax provisions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.