21 T.C. 403 (1953)

Section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides for mitigation of the effect of the statute of limitations, does not apply to situations where the Commissioner's actions do not fall within the specific circumstances outlined in the statute.

Summary

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in Max Schulman's 1945 income tax after the statute of limitations had expired. The deficiency arose from a prior disallowance of a bond premium amortization deduction for 1944, which the Commissioner later reversed based on a Supreme Court decision. The Commissioner argued that Section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code allowed him to assess the 1945 deficiency despite the statute of limitations. The Tax Court, however, held that Section 3801 did not apply because the Commissioner's actions did not meet the specific criteria outlined in the statute, particularly in the context of exclusions from gross income. The court relied on the precedent set in *James Brennen*, concluding that the Commissioner had not met the burden of proving that the exception to the statute of limitations applied.

Facts

1. Max Schulman purchased American Telephone and Telegraph bonds in 1944 and deducted bond premium amortization.

2. The Commissioner disallowed the 1944 deduction, resulting in an additional tax assessment.

3. Schulman sold the bonds in 1945, reporting a capital gain based on the adjusted basis reflecting the disallowed 1944 deduction.

4. The Commissioner, based on an agent's report, adjusted Schulman's 1945 return, decreasing the gain and resulting in an overassessment.

5. Schulman filed a claim for a refund of the 1944 taxes, which was later allowed, following the Supreme Court's decision in *Commissioner v. Korell*.

6. The Commissioner issued a deficiency notice for 1945, seeking to increase the capital gain based on the 1944 deduction disallowance.

Procedural History

The case was heard in the United States Tax Court following a deficiency notice from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Commissioner determined a deficiency in Schulman's income tax for 1945. The key issue was whether the assessment was barred by the statute of limitations or whether Section 3801 of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Internal Revenue Code provided an exception. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the taxpayer, holding the assessment was time-barred.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the assessment of the deficiency for the year 1945 was barred by the statute of limitations under Section 275 of the Internal Revenue Code.

2. Whether the provisions of Section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code, specifically subsections (b)(2), (b)(3), or (b)(5), applied to mitigate the effect of the statute of limitations and allow the assessment of the 1945 deficiency.

Holding

1. Yes, because the notice of deficiency was issued after the expiration of the three-year statute of limitations under Section 275 of the Internal Revenue Code.

2. No, because Section 3801 did not apply, and the Commissioner failed to demonstrate that the circumstances met the specific requirements for mitigation under the statute.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court's reasoning centered on the proper interpretation and application of Section 3801. The court first noted that the assessment for 1945 was time-barred under the general statute of limitations (Section 275). The burden then shifted to the Commissioner to prove that an exception to the statute of limitations applied, specifically under Section 3801. The court considered whether the facts fit within the subsections of 3801 allowing for mitigation. The court found that the Commissioner's actions did not constitute a circumstance covered by Section 3801. The court relied on the case of *James Brennen* and held that Section 3801 did not apply.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of strict adherence to the statute of limitations in tax matters. Tax practitioners must be mindful of the specific requirements of the Internal Revenue Code when seeking to assess deficiencies or obtain refunds outside of the standard limitations period. The case highlights that the government bears the burden of proving that the conditions for applying the mitigation provisions of Section 3801 are met. This case is significant for tax attorneys, accountants, and other tax professionals because it emphasizes that they cannot rely on the mitigation provisions unless the factual circumstances specifically meet the precise requirements of Section 3801. It informs the handling of tax audits and litigation by emphasizing the importance of timely filing claims, and meticulously evaluating the applicability of exceptions to the statute of limitations, and underscores the need to examine the facts carefully to determine whether they

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

meet the specific circumstances required by the statute. This case is directly applicable to situations where the IRS attempts to assess deficiencies or otherwise take actions related to previous tax years after the applicable statute of limitations has expired.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.