Proctor v. Commissioner, 129 T. C. 92 (2007)

In Proctor v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that payments made for children's dental bills under a divorce decree are child support and non-deductible, while payments from military retirement pay to a former spouse are deductible alimony. This decision clarifies the distinction between child support and alimony, impacting how divorce-related payments are treated for tax purposes. The case underscores the importance of specific language in divorce decrees regarding the nature of payments for tax implications.

Parties

Neil Jerome Proctor, the Petitioner, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Respondent, were involved in this case before the United States Tax Court.

Facts

Neil Jerome Proctor and Liza Holdman divorced in December 1993, with the divorce decree mandating shared responsibility for their children's uninsured medical and dental costs and requiring Proctor to pay Holdman 25% of his military retirement pay under the Uniformed Services Former Spouses' Protection Act (USFSPA). Proctor retired from the U. S. Navy in 2000 and subsequently made payments to Holdman in 2002, totaling $6,074, which he claimed as an alimony deduction on his tax return. The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency, disallowing the deduction, asserting that the payments were not alimony.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency to Proctor, disallowing his alimony deduction for 2002. Proctor filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court to contest this determination. The Tax Court reviewed the case de novo, considering whether the payments made to Holdman qualified as alimony or child support under the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

Whether the lump-sum payments made by Proctor to Holdman in 2002 for their children's dental bills and a portion of his military retirement pay qualify as child support or alimony under the Internal Revenue Code?

Rule(s) of Law

Under *26 U. S. C. § 71(c)(1)*, payments designated as child support in a divorce decree are not considered alimony. According to *26 U. S. C. § 71(c)(3)*, if payments are less than the amount required by the divorce decree, they are treated as child support to the extent they do not exceed the required child support amount. Alimony is defined under *26 U. S. C. § 71(b)(1)* and must meet specific criteria, including that

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the payments are not designated as non-includible in gross income and that liability for payments terminates upon the death of the payee spouse, as per *10 U. S. C. § 1408(d)(4)*.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the $2,687 of the $6,074 paid by Proctor in 2002 for their children's dental bills qualified as child support under *26 U. S. C. § 71(c)(3)* and was not deductible. Conversely, the remaining $3,387, representing Holdman's share of Proctor's military retirement pay, qualified as alimony under *26 U. S. C. § 71(b)(1)* and was thus deductible under *26 U. S. C. § 215*.

Reasoning

The court applied the statutory requirements to determine the nature of the payments. For the dental bills, the court adhered to *§ 71(c)(3)*, which mandates that payments less than the required amount be treated as child support. The court also considered Proctor's total obligation under the divorce decree, which was not fully met, leading to the conclusion that a portion of the payments was child support. Regarding the retirement payments, the court analyzed the criteria of *§ 71(b)(1)*, finding that the payments met the necessary conditions to be classified as alimony. The court referenced the USFSPA, which ensures that such payments terminate upon the death of either party, satisfying *§ 71(b)(1)(D)*. The court also relied on precedent such as *Benedict v. Commissioner* to assert that labels attached to payments do not preclude them from being classified as alimony if they meet statutory requirements.

Disposition

The U. S. Tax Court granted Proctor a partial deduction of $3,387 as alimony under *26 U. S. C. § 215* and denied the deduction for $2,687, which was deemed child support.

Significance/Impact

This case is significant for its clarification of the tax treatment of payments under divorce decrees, distinguishing between child support and alimony. It establishes that payments for children's medical expenses are non-deductible child support, while certain payments from retirement benefits can be treated as deductible alimony if they meet statutory criteria. The decision impacts how divorce settlements are drafted to achieve desired tax outcomes and has been cited in subsequent cases dealing with similar issues. It also underscores the importance of the USFSPA in determining the tax implications of military retirement payments in divorce contexts.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.