Estate of George M. Brandon, Deceased, Willard C. Brandon, Executor, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 91 T. C. 829 (1988)

Gender-based dower statutes are unconstitutional under equal protection, and only property interests included in the decedent's gross estate are eligible for the estate tax marital deduction.

Summary

In Estate of Brandon v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed the constitutionality of Arkansas's gender-based dower statute and the extent of the estate tax marital deduction. The decedent's will left his surviving spouse, Chanoy, $25,000, but she elected to take against the will under the Arkansas dower statute, which was later found unconstitutional. The court held that the unconstitutional dower statute could not confer an enforceable right for marital deduction purposes beyond the will's bequest. The estate was thus limited to a $25,000 marital deduction, as only property interests included in the gross estate qualified. This ruling underscores the importance of constitutional compliance in state laws affecting federal tax deductions and the necessity of including property in the gross estate for marital deduction eligibility.

Facts

George M. Brandon's will provided his surviving spouse, Chanoy, with a $25,000 cash bequest. Chanoy elected to take against the will under Arkansas Statutes Annotated section 60-501, which granted a female surviving spouse a dower interest of one-third of the decedent's property. Chanoy challenged transfers made by George and his first wife, Nina Mae, before their deaths. After negotiations, Chanoy settled for $90,000, claiming this as a marital deduction on the estate tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue allowed only $25,000 as a marital deduction, arguing that Chanoy's legal rights were limited to the will's bequest due to the unconstitutional nature of the dower statute.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially allowed the full $90,000 as a marital deduction, but the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit reversed and remanded the case. On remand, the Tax Court was instructed to determine the constitutionality of the Arkansas dower statute, Chanoy's enforceable rights, and whether the marital deduction could include property not part of the gross estate.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Arkansas dower statute was constitutional at the time of the settlement agreement.
2. Whether Chanoy had an enforceable right under state law to amounts in excess of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

one-third of the decedent's gross estate.
3. Whether the estate should be allowed a marital deduction for property passing to the surviving spouse but not included in the decedent's gross estate for estate tax purposes.

Holding

1. No, because the Arkansas dower statute was unconstitutional at the time of the settlement agreement due to its gender-based classification, which failed to meet equal protection standards as established in Orr v. Orr.
2. No, because Chanoy's enforceable right for marital deduction purposes was limited to the $25,000 provided in the will, as the unconstitutional dower statute could not confer additional rights.
3. No, because section 2056(a) of the Internal Revenue Code limits the marital deduction to property interests included in the decedent's gross estate.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the constitutionality of the Arkansas dower statute using the equal protection standard from Orr v. Orr, concluding that the statute's gender-based classification did not serve an important governmental objective that could not be achieved through gender-neutral means. The court noted that subsequent Arkansas cases, such as Stokes v. Stokes, invalidated similar statutes, but the critical date was the settlement's execution. The court found that the unconstitutional statute could not confer an enforceable right beyond the will's bequest, thus limiting the marital deduction to $25,000. The court also clarified that only property included in the gross estate was eligible for the marital deduction, aligning with the statutory requirements of section 2056(a).

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the need for state laws to comply with federal constitutional standards, particularly equal protection, when affecting federal tax deductions. Attorneys should scrutinize state statutes for potential constitutional issues when advising on estate planning and tax matters. The ruling also clarifies that only property interests included in the gross estate are eligible for the marital deduction, necessitating careful estate planning to ensure all intended assets are properly included. Subsequent cases, such as In re Estate of Epperson, have upheld gender-neutral dower statutes, reflecting a shift in legislative response to constitutional rulings. This case serves as a reminder of the interplay between state and federal law in estate tax planning and the importance of aligning estate plans with both.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.