Estate of Eileen S. Belmont, Deceased, Diane Sater, Executrix v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 144 T. C. 84 (2015)

In Estate of Belmont v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that an estate could not claim a charitable contribution deduction under I. R. C. § 642(c)(2) because the funds were not permanently set aside for charity. The estate's financial situation and ongoing litigation over a disputed property made the possibility of using the funds for other purposes more than negligible, affecting the estate's ability to claim the deduction.

Parties

Plaintiff: Estate of Eileen S. Belmont, represented by Diane Sater, Executrix, at trial before the United States Tax Court.

Defendant: Commissioner of Internal Revenue, at trial before the United States Tax Court.

Facts

Eileen S. Belmont died testate on April 1, 2007, in Ohio. Her will directed that her estate's residue be left to the Columbus Jewish Foundation, a recognized § 501(c)(3) charitable organization. At the time of her death, Belmont owned a primary residence in Ohio and a condominium in Santa Monica, California, where her brother David resided. The estate received a $243,463 distribution from the State Teachers Retirement Pension Fund of Ohio, which was income in respect of a decedent under § 691. The estate claimed a $219,580 charitable contribution deduction on its income tax return for the taxable period ending March 31, 2008, based on the will's charitable bequest.

David Belmont, Eileen's brother, resided in the Santa Monica condominium and asserted a life tenancy interest in it, which led to extensive litigation. The estate incurred significant costs due to this legal battle, eventually depleting some of the funds it had set aside for the charitable contribution. By the time of the trial before the Tax Court on September 11, 2013, the estate had approximately $185,000 remaining in its checking account.

Procedural History

The estate filed its first partial fiduciary's account on April 8, 2008, and its income tax return (Form 1041) on July 17, 2008, claiming the charitable contribution deduction. David Belmont filed a creditor's claim on April 2, 2008, asserting a life tenancy interest in the Santa Monica condominium based on an alleged oral agreement. The estate rejected this claim on May 13, 2008. David then filed an 850 Petition to Confirm Interest in Real Property on May 30, 2008, which the estate objected to on July 25, 2008.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

After a trial on October 10, 2011, the Los Angeles County Probate Court ruled in favor of David Belmont on January 26, 2012, awarding him a life tenancy in the condominium. The estate appealed this decision, but the California appellate court upheld the ruling on February 28, 2013. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a notice of deficiency to the estate, determining a $75,662 deficiency in federal income tax for the taxable period ending March 31, 2008. The estate petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which reviewed the case de novo.

Issue(s)

Whether the estate was entitled to a $219,580 charitable contribution deduction under I. R. C. § 642(c)(2) for the taxable period ending March 31, 2008, given the ongoing litigation and financial circumstances that affected the permanency of the set-aside funds?

Rule(s) of Law

I. R. C. § 642(c)(2) allows an estate a deduction for any amount of its gross income that is permanently set aside during the taxable year for a charitable purpose specified in I. R. C. § 170(c). Treasury Regulation § 1. 642(c)-2(d) specifies that no amount will be considered permanently set aside unless the possibility that the amount set aside will not be devoted to the charitable purpose is so remote as to be negligible.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the estate was not entitled to the $219,580 charitable contribution deduction under I. R. C. § 642(c)(2) because the funds were not permanently set aside for charity. The possibility that the estate would use these funds to cover litigation and administrative costs was not so remote as to be negligible.

Reasoning

The court analyzed the “so remote as to be negligible” standard from Treasury Regulation § 1. 642(c)-2(d), which requires that the likelihood of the set-aside funds being used for non-charitable purposes must be highly improbable. The court found that the estate’s financial situation, with only approximately $65,000 remaining after setting aside funds for charity, and the known facts about David Belmont’s legal claims over the Santa Monica condominium, indicated a real possibility that the estate would need to use the set-aside funds for litigation and administrative costs.

The estate argued that the possibility of litigation costs affecting the charitable set-aside was remote, citing cases such as Commissioner v. Upjohn’s Estate and Estate of Wright v. United States. However, the court distinguished these cases, noting that in the present case, there were active claims and legal actions that directly threatened the estate’s ability to maintain the charitable set-aside. The court

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

emphasized that the estate was aware of David's legal actions before filing its Form 1041 and that these actions created a substantial possibility of prolonged and costly litigation.

The court also considered policy considerations, noting that allowing the deduction under these circumstances would undermine the statutory requirement of permanency in charitable set-asides. The court's interpretation of the "so remote as to be negligible" standard was based on its previous rulings in similar contexts under I. R. C. § 170, such as Graev v. Commissioner, where the court defined this standard as a chance that reasonable persons would disregard in serious business transactions.

Disposition

The Tax Court entered a decision for the respondent, disallowing the estate's claimed $219,580 charitable contribution deduction.

Significance/Impact

This case clarifies the application of I. R. C. § 642(c)(2) and the "so remote as to be negligible" standard under Treasury Regulation § 1. 642(c)-2(d). It emphasizes that estates must consider all known facts and potential liabilities when claiming charitable contribution deductions, particularly in the context of ongoing legal disputes that could affect the permanency of set-aside funds. The decision impacts estate planning and tax practice by requiring estates to ensure a high degree of certainty that funds designated for charity will remain available for that purpose.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.