Swope v. Commissioner, 51 T. C. 442 (1968)

The IRS cannot introduce new theories or change its position on appeal that are inconsistent with its original determination of deficiency.

Summary

In Swope v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that the IRS could not introduce a new argument on appeal that contradicted its original deficiency determination. The case involved Jones & Swope, Inc. , which purchased properties from Consolidation Coal Company and later tried to allocate income to two other corporations, Itmann and Pocahontas. The IRS initially allocated all income to Jones & Swope, Inc. , but on appeal, attempted to argue that certain payments were not interest but adjustments to the purchase price. The court rejected this new theory, stating it was inconsistent with the original determination and akin to an "about-face. " The court upheld the IRS's original allocation of income to Jones & Swope, Inc. , as supported by the facts.

Facts

Jones & Swope, Inc. (J&S) entered into a contract with Consolidation Coal Company (Consol) to purchase real and personal properties. J&S paid a down payment and executed a promissory note for the remaining purchase price. J&S managed the properties and collected income, which it reported as 20% commissions on its tax return, allocating the remaining 80% to Itmann and Pocahontas Realty Companies, which were later formed. The IRS determined that all income should be allocated to J&S, and on appeal, attempted to argue that certain payments were not interest but adjustments to the purchase price.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a statutory notice of deficiency to J&S, allocating all income from the properties to J&S. J&S petitioned the Tax Court, arguing that the income should be allocated to Itmann and Pocahontas. During the appeal, the IRS introduced a new argument that certain payments were not interest but adjustments to the purchase price. The Tax Court rejected this new argument and upheld the IRS's original determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the IRS can introduce a new theory on appeal that is inconsistent with its original determination of deficiency.

2. Whether the income from the properties should be allocated to Jones & Swope, Inc. , or to Itmann and Pocahontas Realty Companies.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the IRS’s new theory on appeal was inconsistent with its original determination and amounted to an “about-face,” which is not permitted.

2. Yes, because the income from the properties was attributable to Jones & Swope, Inc. , as it was the sole owner and operator of the properties during the relevant period.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the IRS’s new argument on appeal regarding the nature of certain payments was inconsistent with its original determination and could not be considered. The court emphasized that this was not a case where the determination was inherently supportable by multiple theories, but rather an instance where the IRS was attempting to change its position entirely. The court cited previous cases where similar attempts by the IRS were rejected. Regarding the allocation of income, the court found that J&S was the sole owner and operator of the properties and that the attempted assignments of income to Itmann and Pocahontas were invalid. The court relied on the fact that J&S had executed the contract with Consol, paid the down payment, and managed the properties, while Itmann and Pocahontas had no active role in the properties during the relevant period.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the principle that the IRS cannot change its theories or positions on appeal in a way that contradicts its original deficiency determination. Taxpayers and practitioners should be aware that they can challenge such attempts by the IRS and that the Tax Court will not permit the IRS to introduce new, inconsistent arguments on appeal. The decision also serves as a reminder that income must be allocated to the entity that has actual ownership and control over the income-producing assets, and that attempted assignments of income to other entities will be scrutinized closely by the courts. This case may be cited in future cases where the IRS attempts to change its position on appeal or where the allocation of income between related entities is at issue.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.