Free Fertility Found. v. Comm'r, 135 T. C. 21 (2010) (United States Tax Court)

The U. S. Tax Court ruled that the Free Fertility Foundation does not qualify for tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court found that the foundation's activities of providing sperm from a single donor did not promote health for the community's benefit, as required for charitable exemption. The decision underscores the necessity for organizations to serve a public rather than a private interest to qualify for tax exemption, impacting how similar organizations might structure their operations to meet IRS criteria for charitable status.

Parties

Free Fertility Foundation (Petitioner) v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent)

Facts

William C. Naylor, Jr. , founded the Free Fertility Foundation (the Foundation) on October 15, 2003, as a nonprofit public benefit corporation in California. Its purpose was to provide sperm free of charge to women seeking to become pregnant through artificial insemination or in vitro fertilization, using sperm exclusively from Naylor. Naylor and his father served as the Foundation's board members and officers, with Naylor being the sole financial contributor. The Foundation used an online platform for advertising and required women to submit questionnaires, which were scored by a computer program, with Naylor and his father having the final say on recipient selection. Over a two-year period, the Foundation received 819 inquiries and distributed sperm to 24 women.

Procedural History

On February 6, 2004, the Foundation applied for tax-exempt status as a private operating foundation under Section 501(c)(3) using Form 1023. After a series of communications and a conference, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a final adverse determination letter on June 15, 2007, denying the Foundation's request for exemption. The Foundation filed a petition with the United States Tax Court on July 31, 2007, seeking a declaratory judgment that it met the requirements of Section 501(c)(3). The case was submitted for decision based on the stipulated administrative record.

Issue(s)

Whether the activities of the Free Fertility Foundation promote health for the benefit of the community and thus qualify it for tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Rule(s) of Law

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code provides tax exemption to organizations operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, among others. The operational test under Section 1. 501(c)(3)-1(c), Income Tax Regulations, requires that an organization be operated primarily for exempt purposes, with no more than an insubstantial part of its activities in furtherance of nonexempt purposes. Additionally, an organization must serve a public rather than a private interest to qualify for exemption under Section 1. 501(c)(3)-1(d)(1)(ii), Income Tax Regulations.

Holding

The court held that the Free Fertility Foundation does not qualify for tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) because its activities do not promote health for the benefit of the community. The Foundation's limited class of beneficiaries, selected through a subjective process controlled by Naylor and his father, was deemed insufficient to confer a public benefit.

Reasoning

The court analyzed the Foundation's operations under the operational test and the requirement to serve a public interest. It found that the Foundation's activities, although potentially charitable in providing free sperm, did not meet the criteria for promoting health for the community's benefit. The court noted that the class of potential beneficiaries was restricted to women interested in Naylor's sperm and who met the Foundation's specific, subjective criteria, which were not directly related to health promotion. The court referenced cases like Redlands Surgical Servs. v. Commissioner and Sound Health Association v. Commissioner to establish that promoting health requires benefiting the community as a whole. The Foundation's lack of medical care, research, or educational services, and its preference criteria unrelated to health, were significant in the court's reasoning. The court also considered Naylor's personal belief in the positive impact of his donations but found it insufficient to establish a public benefit. The court concluded that the Foundation's operations did not exclusively serve exempt purposes, thus disqualifying it from tax exemption.

Disposition

The court entered a decision for the respondent, affirming the Commissioner's denial of tax-exempt status to the Free Fertility Foundation.

Significance/Impact

This case clarifies the application of Section 501(c)(3) to organizations claiming to promote health, emphasizing the necessity of serving a broad public interest. It sets a precedent for how similar organizations must structure their operations to qualify for charitable tax exemption, particularly those providing health-related services or

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

products. The decision impacts the legal framework for evaluating the public benefit of nonprofit activities and may influence future interpretations of the operational test under Section 501(c)(3).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.