Estate of John Iverson, Deceased, Mardrid Davison and Gladys Sorensen, Co-Executrices, et al., Petitioners, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 27 T.C. 786 (1957)

The 5-year statute of limitations for assessing tax deficiencies applies if a taxpayer omits from gross income an amount exceeding 25% of the gross income stated in the return.

Summary

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies against several taxpayers, including the Estate of John Iverson, for the years 1947 and 1948. The primary issue was whether the assessments were timely, given that they were made more than three years but less than five years after the returns were filed. The court held that the 5-year statute of limitations applied because the taxpayers had omitted substantial amounts of gross income from their returns, specifically credit sales from their electrical supply businesses. The court rejected the taxpayers' attempts to reclassify expenses to reduce the reported gross income and thereby avoid the extended statute of limitations.

Facts

John Iverson, Alvilda Iverson, and Mardrid Reite Davison owned interests in several partnerships that sold electrical supplies and fixtures. The partnerships kept their books on an accrual basis. In preparing the partnership tax returns, credit sales were omitted, and only cash sales were reported. The amounts of unreported credit sales were significant. Each of the taxpayers reported their net income from the partnerships and other income sources on their individual income tax returns. The Commissioner issued notices of deficiency for the years 1947 and 1948 more than three but less than five years after the returns were filed. The taxpayers did not file waivers of the statute of limitations.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the taxpayers' income taxes. The taxpayers challenged the deficiencies in the United States Tax Court. The primary argument made by the taxpayers was that the assessments were time-barred because they were made after the standard 3-year statute of limitations had expired. The Tax Court consolidated the cases for trial. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayers omitted from their gross income an amount properly includible therein which exceeded 25% of the gross income stated in their returns for 1947 and 1948.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

2. Whether, for purposes of determining if an omission from gross income exceeded the 25% threshold under the statute, the term “gross income stated in the return” should include the individual partner’s allocable share of the gross income of the partnership as shown by the partnership return or only the gross income stated in the individual return, including the partner’s distributive share of partnership net income.

Holding

1. Yes, because the taxpayers omitted a significant amount of gross income from their returns, as represented by unreported credit sales from their businesses, exceeding 25% of the gross income reported.

2. The Court did not resolve this issue, noting that the outcome was the same under either interpretation because the omission from the gross income figures on the individual returns exceeded 25% regardless.

Court's Reasoning

The court referenced Section 275(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which provided a 5-year statute of limitations if the taxpayer omitted from gross income an amount exceeding 25% of the gross income stated in the return. The court found that the taxpayers omitted significant amounts of credit sales from the gross receipts of their businesses. It held that the unreported credit sales constituted gross income that should have been included in the returns. The court calculated that the taxpayers’ share of the omitted credit sales exceeded 25% of the gross income stated in their individual returns. The court also rejected the taxpayers’ argument that expenses deducted as “deductions” could be reclassified to reduce the gross income, because the gross income reported in the return is the controlling figure and the taxpayers were bound by that statement. The court noted the taxpayers did not claim that the cost of goods sold figures were understated because certain costs and expenses were never reflected in the returns.

Practical Implications

This case is critical for tax attorneys because it underscores the importance of accurately reporting gross income, especially when dealing with partnerships and businesses with credit sales. It reinforces the rule that the 5-year statute of limitations will apply when there is a significant omission of gross income. Furthermore, it indicates that taxpayers cannot easily revise gross income figures by reclassifying expenses after the fact to avoid the extended statute of limitations. Attorneys should advise clients to carefully review all income sources and to make accurate and complete disclosures in their returns. Taxpayers should maintain detailed records, particularly when dealing with partnerships, to support the reported gross income and prevent potential disputes with the IRS. This case also illustrates the importance of understanding how omissions from partnership income

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

affect an individual partner’s tax liability and the applicable statute of limitations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 