Addis v. Commissioner, 118 T. C. 528 (2002)

In Addis v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that taxpayers could not deduct payments made to the National Heritage Foundation (NHF) as charitable contributions due to failure to meet substantiation requirements under Section 170(f)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Addises had paid NHF to fund life insurance premiums in a split-dollar arrangement, expecting NHF to use the funds for both parties' benefit. The court found that NHF's receipts did not accurately disclose the benefits received by the Addises, thus invalidating their claimed deductions. This decision underscores the importance of proper substantiation for charitable deductions, particularly in complex financial arrangements.

Parties

Charles H. Addis and Cindi Addis, Petitioners, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent. The Addises were the plaintiffs throughout the proceedings, while the Commissioner was the defendant.

Facts

In 1997 and 1998, Charles and Cindi Addis made payments totaling $36,285 and $36,000, respectively, to the National Heritage Foundation (NHF), a Section 501(c)(3) organization. These payments were used by NHF to pay premiums on a life insurance policy on Cindi Addis's life, which was part of a charitable split-dollar life insurance arrangement. Under this arrangement, NHF was entitled to 56% of the death benefit, while the Addis family trust, established by the petitioners, was entitled to the remaining 44%. The Addises claimed these payments as charitable contributions on their tax returns. NHF provided receipts stating that no goods or services were provided in exchange for the payments, but the Addises expected NHF to use the funds for the premiums, which would secure the death benefit for both NHF and the Addis family trust.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a notice of deficiency disallowing the Addises' claimed charitable contribution deductions for the years 1997 and 1998. The Addises petitioned the United States Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court reviewed the case de novo, applying the substantiation requirements under Section 170(f)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code and related regulations.

Issue(s)

Whether the Addises' payments to the National Heritage Foundation qualify as deductible charitable contributions under Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code when the contemporaneous written acknowledgments by NHF did not disclose the benefits received by the Addises?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

Section 170(f)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code requires that no deduction shall be allowed for any contribution of $250 or more unless substantiated by a contemporaneous written acknowledgment from the donee organization. This acknowledgment must include the amount of cash contributed, whether the donee provided any goods or services in consideration for the contribution, and a good faith estimate of the value of such goods or services. Section 1. 170A-13(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations defines consideration as goods or services provided by the donee if the donor expects to receive such in exchange for the payment.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the Addises' payments to NHF were not deductible as charitable contributions because they failed to meet the substantiation requirements of Section 170(f)(8) and Section 1. 170A-13(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations. NHF's receipts did not accurately reflect that the Addises received benefits in the form of a life insurance policy, thus invalidating the claimed deductions.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that despite NHF not being contractually obligated to use the Addises' payments for the life insurance premiums, the Addises expected and reasonably anticipated that NHF would use the funds for this purpose. This expectation constituted consideration under Section 1. 170A-13(f)(6), as the Addises anticipated receiving 44% of the policy's death benefit. NHF's failure to disclose these benefits in its receipts violated the substantiation requirements, which mandate a clear acknowledgment of any goods or services provided in exchange for a donation. The court highlighted that the legislative history of Section 170(f)(8) aimed to prevent donors from claiming deductions for payments that were partly in consideration for benefits received. The court also noted that the Addises and NHF structured the transaction to appear as an outright gift, but the reality was that both parties benefited from the arrangement, thus undermining the validity of the claimed charitable deductions.

Disposition

The Tax Court entered a decision in favor of the respondent, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, disallowing the Addises' claimed charitable contribution deductions for the years 1997 and 1998.

Significance/Impact

Addis v. Commissioner is significant for its reinforcement of the strict substantiation requirements for charitable contributions under Section 170(f)(8). The case illustrates the complexities of charitable split-dollar life insurance arrangements and the necessity for clear and accurate disclosures by charitable organizations. It has

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

implications for taxpayers and charities engaging in similar arrangements, emphasizing the need for transparency in reporting any benefits received by donors. Subsequent cases and IRS guidance have continued to uphold these principles, affecting how such transactions are structured and reported to ensure compliance with tax laws.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.