20 T.C. 79 (1953)

The statute of limitations for tax assessment based on omission of gross income is determined by the original tax return; subsequent amended returns do not retroactively alter this period.

Summary

In *Goldring v. Commissioner*, the Tax Court addressed whether amended tax returns, filed after the original returns, could retroactively reduce the omission of gross income below 25% and thus shorten the statute of limitations for tax assessment. The petitioners, Ira and Jessica Goldring, filed original returns for 1945 that omitted more than 25% of their gross income, which triggers a 5-year statute of limitations under Section 275(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. They later filed amended returns, reducing the omission below the 25% threshold. The Tax Court held that the 5-year statute of limitations applied, as it is determined by the original return, and amended returns do not have retroactive effect for statute of limitations purposes. This decision clarifies that taxpayers cannot use amended returns to manipulate the statute of limitations period once the extended period is triggered by the original filing.

Facts

1. On March 15, 1946, Ira and Jessica Goldring filed separate original individual income tax returns for the calendar year 1945.
2. These original returns each showed a tax liability that was paid.
3. Fifteen months later, on June 16, 1947, both petitioners filed amended returns for 1945, showing a higher tax liability, which was also paid.
4. The original returns omitted from gross income an amount exceeding 25% of the gross income stated in those returns.
5. The amended returns reduced the omission of gross income to less than 25% of the gross income stated in the amended returns.
6. On March 14 and 15, 1951, the Commissioner issued statutory notices of deficiency for the 1945 tax year, asserting the 5-year statute of limitations under Section 275(c) was applicable due to the omission in the original returns.
7. No consents extending the statute of limitations were executed by either petitioner for the calendar year 1945.

Procedural History

The case was initially brought before the United States Tax Court. This opinion represents the Tax Court’s ruling on the matter of the statute of limitations.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the assessment and collection of income tax deficiencies for the year 1945 are barred by the general three-year statute of limitations under Section

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

275(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the filing of amended returns, which reduced the omission of gross income to less than 25%, retroactively nullifies the applicability of the extended five-year statute of limitations under Section 275(c), which is triggered by an omission exceeding 25% in the original return.

Holding

1. No, the assessment and collection of deficiencies for 1945 are not barred because the five-year statute of limitations under Section 275(c) applies.
2. No, because the statute of limitations is determined based on the original return, and subsequent amended returns do not retroactively alter the conditions established by the original filing that trigger the extended statute of limitations period.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the plain language of Section 275 of the Internal Revenue Code refers to "the return," which has consistently been interpreted by courts to mean the original return. The court emphasized that there is no statutory provision for amended returns to retroactively change the legal effect of the original return concerning the statute of limitations. The court cited numerous precedents, including *National Refining Co. of Ohio* and *Riley Investment Co. v. Commissioner*, to support the principle that the statute of limitations begins to run from the filing of the original return and is not affected by subsequent amended filings.

The court stated, "The word 'return' has been construed in numerous cases to include only the original return." It further quoted from *National Refining Co. of Ohio*, highlighting that the statutory language uses the definite article "the" and a singular subject, indicating a single, specific return intended by the statute – the original return.

The court also addressed the practical implications of the petitioners' argument, noting that if amended returns could retroactively alter the statute of limitations, taxpayers could strategically file deficient original returns and later file amended returns to manipulate the assessment period. The court drew an analogy to fraud penalty cases, where amended returns do not negate penalties triggered by fraudulent original returns, reinforcing the principle that subsequent actions do not erase the consequences of the initial filing.

Practical Implications

Goldring v. Commissioner firmly establishes that for statute of limitations purposes in tax law, particularly concerning the extended period for substantial omissions of gross income, the controlling document is the original tax return. This case has several practical implications for legal professionals and taxpayers:

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

* **Statute of Limitations Certainty**: It provides certainty to the IRS and taxpayers that the statute of limitations is triggered and determined by the content of the originally filed return. Amended returns, while important for correcting errors, do not retroactively change the statute of limitations period set by the original filing.
* **Emphasis on Original Return Accuracy**: Taxpayers and preparers are incentivized to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the original return. Errors, especially substantial omissions of income, can trigger extended assessment periods that cannot be retroactively shortened by later amendments.
* **Limits of Amended Returns**: While amended returns can correct tax liabilities and potentially reduce penalties in some contexts, they cannot be used as a tool to circumvent the statute of limitations triggered by deficiencies in the original return.
* **Legal Strategy and Advice**: Legal practitioners advising clients on tax matters must consider the original return as the critical document for statute of limitations issues. When advising on amended returns, it is crucial to understand their limitations in altering previously established legal timelines.
* **Consistency with Fraud Cases**: The decision aligns with the principle established in fraud penalty cases, maintaining consistency in how amended returns are treated in relation to the legal consequences stemming from original tax filings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.