2 T.C. 726 (1943)

A taxpayer can amend a petition to the Tax Court after the statute of limitations has expired to include a claim for a refund, provided the original petition stated a cause of action, even if it did not explicitly request a refund.

Summary

Lois E. Scott filed a petition with the Board of Tax Appeals (now the Tax Court) contesting a deficiency determination by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue related to a stock dividend. While the original petition argued the dividend was non-taxable, it did not explicitly request a refund of taxes already paid. After the statute of limitations had run, Scott amended her petition to include a claim for a refund. The Tax Court held that because the original petition stated a cause of action by alleging the dividend was non-taxable, the amendment seeking a refund was permissible, and Scott was entitled to a refund for payments made within three years of filing the original petition.

Facts

Lois E. Scott reported dividend income on her 1936 tax return and paid taxes accordingly.

The Commissioner later determined a deficiency based on an increased valuation of certain stock received as a dividend.

Scott executed a consent extending the period of limitations for assessment.

Scott’s original petition contested the deficiency, arguing that the stock dividend was non-taxable because the issuing company had no earned surplus and the dividend represented a return of capital.

The original petition did not contain a prayer for a refund of taxes already paid on the dividend.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency, and Scott filed a petition with the Board of Tax Appeals.

Scott later amended her petition to include a prayer for a redetermination of her tax liability and a claim for a refund.

The Commissioner confessed error on the deficiency issue, agreeing that no deficiency existed.

The Tax Court then considered whether the amended petition, filed after the statute

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

of limitations, could support a claim for a refund.

Issue(s)

Whether a taxpayer can amend a petition to the Tax Court after the statute of limitations has expired to include a claim for a refund when the original petition contested a deficiency but did not explicitly request a refund.

Holding

Yes, because the original petition stated a cause of action by alleging the dividend was non-taxable, the amendment seeking a refund was permissible, and Scott was entitled to a refund for payments made within three years of filing the original petition.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that if the original petition states a cause of action, the prayer for relief can be amended and enlarged after the statute of limitations has expired. The court stated, "In this behalf, indeed, the prayer for damages is no part of the statement of facts required to constitute a cause of action."

The court found that the original petition, while not explicitly seeking a refund, did allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action for overpayment, specifically that the stock dividend was non-taxable. The court noted that the original petition recited "that the petitioner on December 28, 1936, owned certain shares of stock; that, in accordance with the plan of recapitalization described in the petition, petitioner accepted certain other shares of stock as a credit on dividends accumulated on the stock held; that it was the petitioner's contention that the receipt of the stock as a credit on unpaid accumulated dividends added nothing of value to what the shareholder theretofore had, gave her no additional right or credit to the assets of the corporation, and for that reason the stock received was nontaxable; also that the dividends were paid from capital, so not taxable."

Because the original petition presented the core issue of taxability, the amended petition merely clarified the desired relief, which related back to the original claim.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the circumstances under which taxpayers can amend petitions to the Tax Court to claim refunds after the statute of limitations has run.

It emphasizes the importance of including factual allegations that state a cause of action in the original petition, even if the specific relief requested is not initially articulated.

Practitioners should ensure that original petitions clearly articulate the legal basis

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

for contesting a tax liability, even if a refund is not explicitly requested, to preserve the possibility of amendment later.

This ruling allows taxpayers some flexibility in framing their arguments before the Tax Court, provided the core legal issue is raised in a timely manner.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.