

Estate of Aldo H. Fontana, Deceased, Richard A. Fontana and Joan F. Rebotarro, Co-Executors v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 118 T. C. 318 (U. S. Tax Court 2002)

The U. S. Tax Court ruled that for federal estate tax valuation, stocks subject to a decedent's testamentary general power of appointment must be aggregated with stocks owned outright. This decision impacts estate planning, affirming that such powers are akin to ownership, thereby affecting how assets are valued and taxed upon death. The case underscores the importance of considering the full scope of control over assets in estate tax calculations.

Parties

The petitioner was the Estate of Aldo H. Fontana, with Richard A. Fontana and Joan F. Rebotarro as Co-Executors. The respondent was the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Facts

Aldo and Doris Fontana owned all outstanding shares of Fontana Ledyard Co. , Inc. (Ledyard) as community property. Upon Doris's death, her estate was divided into Trust A and Trust B. Aldo served as trustee for both and had a testamentary general power of appointment (GPA) over Trust A, which held 44. 069% of Ledyard's stock. Aldo owned 50% of Ledyard's stock outright. At his death, Aldo exercised his GPA to divide Trust A's assets into trusts for his children. The estate reported the value of each stock block separately for tax purposes, but the Commissioner argued they should be aggregated.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency determining an estate tax deficiency of \$830,720, asserting that the 50% and 44. 069% blocks of Ledyard stock should be valued together as a 94. 069% block. The case was submitted to the U. S. Tax Court fully stipulated. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's position, ruling that the stocks should be aggregated for valuation purposes.

Issue(s)

Whether, for federal estate tax valuation purposes, stock owned outright by the decedent must be aggregated with stock over which the decedent possessed a testamentary general power of appointment?

Rule(s) of Law

The fair market value of property included in a decedent's gross estate is determined as of the date of death per 26 U. S. C. § 2031(a) and 26 C. F. R. § 20. 2031-1(b). For estate tax purposes, a general power of appointment is considered

equivalent to outright ownership, as established by cases such as *Graves v. Schmidlapp*, 315 U. S. 657 (1942), and *Peterson Marital Trust v. Commissioner*, 78 F. 3d 795 (2d Cir. 1996).

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that for federal estate tax valuation purposes, the stock subject to Aldo's testamentary general power of appointment must be aggregated with the stock he owned outright, treating the total as a 94.069% block of Ledyard stock.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that a testamentary general power of appointment is akin to outright ownership because it allows the powerholder to control the ultimate disposition of the property. The court distinguished this case from *Estate of Mellinger v. Commissioner*, 112 T. C. 26 (1999), which involved a QTIP trust where the surviving spouse did not control the ultimate disposition of the property. The court emphasized that Aldo's GPA over Trust A's stock was equivalent to ownership at the moment of death, thus necessitating aggregation for valuation. The court rejected the estate's arguments based on family attribution rules, noting that those rules were irrelevant since Aldo had complete control over both stock blocks at the time of death.

Disposition

The Tax Court sustained the Commissioner's determination, and a decision was entered for the respondent under Rule 155.

Significance/Impact

This decision reinforces the principle that a testamentary general power of appointment is treated as equivalent to outright ownership for estate tax valuation purposes. It has significant implications for estate planning, as it affects how assets subject to such powers are valued and taxed. The ruling may lead to increased estate tax liabilities where assets under a GPA are significant and could prompt estate planners to reconsider strategies involving general powers of appointment to minimize tax exposure. Subsequent cases and legal practice have considered this ruling when addressing similar issues of asset valuation in estates with testamentary powers of appointment.