Cory v. Commissioner, 27 T.C. 909 (1957)

The statute of limitations on assessing a tax deficiency can be extended if a taxpayer has taken an inconsistent position that resulted in the erroneous omission of income from a prior year's return and a determination is made that adopts that position.

Summary

The Commissioner determined a tax deficiency for 1945, which the taxpayers contested by arguing the statute of limitations had expired. The Tax Court found that the statute of limitations did not bar the assessment because the taxpayers had taken a position in a prior proceeding regarding their 1944 tax return that was inconsistent with their 1945 return. Specifically, they had claimed that only a portion of certain royalties was received in 1944, leading to a determination that adopted this position. The court reasoned that this inconsistent position allowed the Commissioner to assess the deficiency in 1945, as it effectively addressed the erroneous omission of income that was reported in 1944 but was actually received and taxable in 1945, falling under the Internal Revenue Code's provisions for correcting errors. The Tax Court held for the Commissioner.

Facts

In 1942, Daniel M. Cory received a manuscript from George Santayana, with an agreement for publication and royalties. A dispute ensued, and royalties were placed in escrow. In 1944, $42,363.57 was paid into escrow; $12,000 was paid to Cory that year. The dispute settled in 1945, with the balance distributed: $12,709.08 to the collector of internal revenue, $1,500 to Scribner's, and $16,048.58 to Cory. The 1944 tax return reported $42,057.66 as income. In 1948, Cory filed a refund claim, arguing that only $12,000 was received in 1944 and the rest was taxable to Santayana. In 1951, the Commissioner assessed a deficiency, treating all amounts as ordinary income. The Tax Court agreed that only $12,000 was received in 1944. The deficiency notice was issued December 20, 1956, more than ten years after the original return was filed.

Procedural History

The taxpayers filed their 1944 tax return. They later filed a claim for refund. The Commissioner determined a deficiency for 1944. The taxpayers petitioned the Tax Court, which held that the proceeds were taxable as ordinary income and that only $12,000 was received in 1944. The taxpayers appealed the ordinary income holding, but the appellate court affirmed. The Commissioner then issued a notice of deficiency for 1945, triggering the current case in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the statute of limitations barred the assessment of a tax deficiency for 1945.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the Commissioner could assess the deficiency under sections 1311-1314 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Court's Reasoning

The court addressed whether the statute of limitations prevented the assessment. It explained that the statute can be extended under sections 1311 to 1314 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct an error. The court found that the taxpayers' position in their refund claim and in the prior Tax Court case (that only $12,000 was received in 1944) was inconsistent with their 1944 return (which reported the total amount as income). The court emphasized the taxpayer's "inconsistent position" which was "adopted in the determination of the Tax Court". This determination required the exclusion of an item from the 1945 return that was erroneously included in the 1944 return. This triggered the mitigation provisions, which allowed the Commissioner to assess the deficiency even though the statute of limitations had run. The court cited section 1312(3)(A) which pertains to the double exclusion of income. The court found that the notice of deficiency was within the one-year period after the determination became final. The court also addressed the taxpayers' argument that the Commissioner's failure to appeal the Tax Court's decision meant the determination became final. However, the court clarified that since the 1944 case was appealed, no part of it became final until the appeal was decided. The court concluded that the deficiency notice was timely.

Practical Implications

This case is important for tax attorneys because it demonstrates the application of the mitigation provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC), which allow for the correction of errors even after the statute of limitations has expired, in certain circumstances. The key takeaway is that a taxpayer cannot benefit from an inconsistent position that results in the omission of income from one tax year, if that position is adopted in a determination. Lawyers should:

- Carefully analyze prior positions taken by a taxpayer, especially in claims for refund or petitions to the Tax Court, to determine whether those positions are consistent with the current filing.
- Be aware of the specific requirements for the application of the mitigation provisions.
- Understand that the Commissioner can use the mitigation provisions to assess deficiencies related to the omitted income.
- Realize that appeals of prior decisions extend the time for finality.

The case illustrates the importance of consistency in tax reporting and the potential consequences of taking inconsistent positions, especially when those positions are adopted by the IRS or the courts. It affects the analysis of how to treat income

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

across multiple tax years. The court's emphasis on the taxpayers' inconsistent position serves as a warning against taking advantage of potential errors. It also underlines the Commissioner's ability to correct these errors when the statutory conditions are met, even beyond the normal statute of limitations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.