Ungerman Revocable Trust v. Commissioner, 89 T. C. 1131 (1987)

Interest paid on deferred estate tax liability under section 6166 is deductible as an administration expense under section 212, thus exempting it from the alternative minimum tax under section 55.

Summary

The Charles H. Ungerman, Jr. Revocable Trust sought to deduct interest paid on deferred estate tax liability as an administration expense under section 212, rather than as an itemized deduction under section 163, to avoid the alternative minimum tax under section 55. The Tax Court held that the interest was indeed deductible as an administration expense, as it was incurred to preserve estate assets by avoiding forced sales. This ruling allowed the trust to bypass the alternative minimum tax, highlighting the significance of classifying such expenses under section 212 for tax planning purposes.

Facts

Charles H. Ungerman, Jr. established a revocable trust on August 1, 1979, which continued after his death on August 3, 1981. The estate, valued at $58,600,018, primarily comprised Walbar, Inc. stock, valued at $56,824,589. The executor elected to defer payment of the Federal estate tax under section 6166 due to the stock's classification as a closely held business interest. During the fiscal year ending May 31, 1983, the trust paid $1,950,509. 47 in interest on the deferred estate tax liability. The trust claimed this interest as an administration expense deduction under section 212 on its fiduciary income tax return, asserting that it was not subject to the alternative minimum tax under section 55.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a notice of deficiency on January 10, 1986, challenging the trust's deduction and asserting that the interest was deductible only under section 163, making it an itemized deduction subject to the alternative minimum tax. The case was submitted to the United States Tax Court fully stipulated under Rule 122. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the trust, holding that the interest was deductible as an administration expense under section 212.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the interest paid on the deferred Federal estate tax liability under section 6166 qualifies as a deduction for a cost paid or incurred in connection with the administration of an estate or trust under section 212.

Holding

1. Yes, because the interest expense was an ordinary and necessary administration

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

expense incurred to preserve the estate's assets by avoiding forced sales, making it deductible under section 212 and thus not subject to the alternative minimum tax under section 55.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the interest expense was an ordinary and necessary administration expense incurred to manage and preserve the estate's assets, particularly the Walbar stock. The court cited Estate of Bahr v. Commissioner, which established that expenses incurred to avoid forced sales are deductible as administration expenses for estate tax purposes. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that the interest was only deductible under section 163, holding that sections 212 and 163 are of equal dignity and not inconsistent with each other. The court emphasized that the interest was paid in connection with the management and conservation of income-producing property, satisfying the requirements of section 212. The court also noted that the interest was allowed as an administration expense by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, supporting its classification as such for federal tax purposes.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that interest paid on deferred estate tax under section 6166 can be classified as an administration expense under section 212, thereby avoiding the alternative minimum tax under section 55. Estate planners and tax professionals should consider this ruling when structuring estates with significant closely held business interests, as it provides a strategy to minimize tax liabilities. The decision underscores the importance of classifying expenses correctly for tax purposes and may influence how similar cases are analyzed in the future. It also highlights the need to consider state law classifications of expenses when determining their federal tax treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.