Herman Bennett Co. v. Commissioner, 65 T. C. 506 (1975)

The statute of limitations for assessing deficiencies attributable to an investment credit carryback is extended when the carryback is due to a net operating loss carryback from a subsequent year.

Summary

In Herman Bennett Co. v. Commissioner, the taxpayer incurred a net operating loss in 1969, which was carried back to 1966, releasing an investment credit previously allowed. This credit was erroneously carried back to 1963, leading to an overpayment refund. The IRS later issued a notice of deficiency for 1963 within the statute of limitations for 1969. The Tax Court held that the deficiency notice was timely under Section 6501(j) because the erroneous carryback to 1963 was directly attributable to the net operating loss carryback from 1969 to 1966, thus extending the limitations period to that of the 1969 tax year.

Facts

The Herman Bennett Co. reported a net operating loss of $152,533. 23 in 1969 and requested a carryback to 1966, which was allowed, eliminating all taxable income for 1966 and releasing a previously allowed investment credit of $10,749. 90. The company then claimed a portion of this released credit as a carryback to 1963, resulting in a refund of $6,160. 98. However, this carryback was erroneous because the maximum allowable credit for 1963 had already been applied. The IRS issued a notice of deficiency for 1963 on June 11, 1974.

Procedural History

The IRS audited the Herman Bennett Co. ‘s tax returns for 1963 through 1967, resulting in adjustments. After the company claimed a net operating loss carryback from 1969 to 1966 and an erroneous investment credit carryback to 1963, the IRS allowed a refund. Upon discovering the error, the IRS issued a notice of deficiency for 1963 on June 11, 1974. The Tax Court upheld the timeliness of this notice, ruling in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the statute of limitations for assessing a deficiency in the Herman Bennett Co. ‘s 1963 tax year had expired prior to the issuance of the deficiency notice on June 11, 1974.

Holding

1. No, because the deficiency for 1963 was attributable to the net operating loss carryback from 1969 to 1966, which extended the limitations period under Section 6501(j) to the period applicable to the 1969 tax year.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 6501(j), which extends the statute of limitations for deficiencies related to investment credit carrybacks when those carrybacks are attributable to a net operating loss carryback from a subsequent year. The court found that the erroneous carryback to 1963 was directly linked to the 1969 net operating loss carryback to 1966, as the release of the 1966 investment credit was a direct result of the 1969 carryback. The court emphasized that the source of the investment credit (earned in 1965) was irrelevant; what mattered was that the carryback itself was attributable to the net operating loss carryback. The court also noted that the IRS had discretion in choosing to assess a deficiency rather than pursuing other remedies like a suit for erroneous refund. The court concluded that the notice of deficiency for 1963 was timely because it was issued within the three-year limitations period applicable to the 1969 tax year.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that when an investment credit carryback arises from a net operating loss carryback, the statute of limitations for assessing deficiencies related to the investment credit carryback extends to the period applicable to the year of the net operating loss. Practitioners should be aware that such carrybacks can significantly extend the IRS’s ability to assess deficiencies, even for years far removed from the year of the net operating loss. This ruling may affect tax planning strategies involving net operating losses and investment credits, as taxpayers need to consider the potential for extended audit periods. Subsequent cases, such as Gordon L. Krieger and John S. Neri, have followed this precedent, further solidifying the rule’s application in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.