Estate of Albert F. Metzger, Deceased, John A. Metzger and Z. Townsend Parks, Jr. , Personal Representatives v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 100 T. C. 204 (1993)

A gift by check is complete for tax purposes upon unconditional delivery and deposit within the same year, even if the check is not cleared until the following year.

Summary

In Estate of Metzger v. Commissioner, the Tax Court held that gifts made by check are considered complete for tax purposes when unconditionally delivered and deposited within the same year, even if not cleared until the next year. Albert Metzger's son, acting under a power of attorney, issued checks in December 1985 that were deposited by the donees on December 31 but not cleared until January 1986. The court applied the relation-back doctrine, ruling that the gifts were complete in 1985 and thus qualified for the annual exclusion, impacting how attorneys should advise clients on the timing of year-end gifts.

Facts

Albert Metzger executed a power of attorney authorizing his son, John, to make gifts on his behalf. On December 14, 1985, John issued four checks from Albert's account to himself, his wife, and two others. These checks were deposited into a joint account on December 31, 1985, but not cleared by the bank until January 2, 1986. Albert died in 1987, and his estate did not report these gifts on the federal estate tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the estate tax, asserting that the gifts were taxable because they were completed in 1986. The estate petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination. Both parties filed cross-motions for partial summary judgment, and the case was decided based on stipulated facts.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the gifts made by check were complete in 1985 when the checks were delivered and deposited, or in 1986 when the checks were cleared by the bank.
2. Whether the relation-back doctrine applies to noncharitable gifts made by check.

Holding

1. No, because under Maryland law, a gift by check is not complete until accepted by the drawee bank. However, yes, because the relation-back doctrine applies to relate the acceptance back to the time of deposit in 1985.
2. Yes, because the relation-back doctrine can apply to noncharitable gifts when the checks are unconditionally delivered and deposited within the year, and cleared

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

shortly thereafter.

Court’s Reasoning

The court first established that under Maryland law, a gift by check remains incomplete until the check is presented for payment and accepted by the drawee bank. The court noted that the power of attorney did not change this rule, as the donor could still revoke the gift before it was cleared. However, the court applied the relation-back doctrine, previously used for charitable gifts, to this case involving noncharitable gifts. The court reasoned that since the checks were unconditionally delivered and deposited within 1985, and cleared shortly thereafter, the payment related back to the time of deposit. The court cited Estate of Spiegel and Estate of Belcher for the practical realities of commerce, extending the doctrine to noncharitable gifts under specific conditions. The court emphasized that the gifts were intended, unconditionally delivered, and presented for payment within the year, supporting the application of the relation-back doctrine.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that gifts by check can be considered complete for tax purposes in the year they are unconditionally delivered and deposited, even if not cleared until the following year. Attorneys should advise clients to ensure checks are deposited by year-end to qualify for the annual exclusion. This ruling may encourage year-end gift planning to minimize estate taxes. The decision distinguishes between charitable and noncharitable gifts, but extends the relation-back doctrine to the latter under specific conditions. Subsequent cases like Estate of Dillingham and Estate of Gagliardi have further refined the application of this doctrine, impacting how similar cases are analyzed.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.