Estate of DiPorto v. Commissioner, 65 T. C. 49 (1975)

A nonresident alien's entire calendar year must be considered as a taxable year for income averaging eligibility, regardless of when they become a resident alien within that year.

Summary

In Estate of DiPorto v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that the entire calendar year must be considered when determining the eligibility of a taxpayer for income averaging, even if they were a nonresident alien for part of that year. Jose DiPorto, a Cuban immigrant, claimed that only the portion of 1960 during which he was a resident alien should be considered for his base period for income averaging in 1964. The court rejected this argument, holding that the full calendar year of 1960 must be included, making him ineligible for income averaging due to his nonresident status at any time during the base period. This decision underscores the importance of considering the entire taxable year for tax purposes, regardless of changes in residency status within that year.

Facts

Jose and Adela DiPorto, Cuban residents, moved to the United States due to Fidel Castro's rise to power. Their property in Cuba was expropriated, resulting in a deductible loss. Jose entered the U. S. on multiple occasions between 1958 and 1960, and became a U. S. citizen in 1966. He was a nonresident alien for part of 1960, the year in question. In 1964, the DiPortos had taxable income of $204,747. 19 and sought to use income averaging to reduce their tax liability. The IRS challenged their eligibility for income averaging due to Jose's nonresident alien status during part of the base period year 1960.

Procedural History

The case was brought before the U. S. Tax Court after the IRS determined deficiencies in the DiPortos' federal income taxes for the years 1962, 1963, and 1964. All issues were resolved except for the question of whether the DiPortos could use income averaging for the taxable year 1964.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the entire calendar year 1960, during which Jose DiPorto was a nonresident alien for part of the year, should be included in the base period for income averaging under section 1303(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the term "taxable year" under the Internal Revenue Code refers to the entire calendar year, regardless of changes in residency status within that year.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Therefore, Jose’s nonresident alien status for part of 1960 disqualified the DiPortos from income averaging in 1964.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court’s decision hinged on the interpretation of the term “taxable year” as defined in section 7701(a)(23) of the Internal Revenue Code, which refers to the calendar year or fiscal year. The court rejected the DiPortos’ argument that only the period during which Jose was a resident alien should be considered for income averaging, as this interpretation was not supported by the statutory provisions. The court emphasized that nonresident aliens are subject to U. S. income tax on certain types of income, and thus, the entire calendar year must be considered as the taxable year. The court also noted the IRS’s long-standing policy of treating taxpayers with changes in residency status as dual-status taxpayers for the entire year, requiring a full-year return. Furthermore, the court considered the legislative intent behind the income averaging provisions, which aimed to prevent nonresident aliens from gaining undue tax advantages. The court concluded that allowing a “short taxable year” for income averaging would contravene this intent.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for the purposes of income averaging, the entire calendar year must be considered, even if a taxpayer’s residency status changes within that year. This ruling affects how tax practitioners should analyze similar cases involving nonresident aliens seeking income averaging. It reinforces the IRS’s position on dual-status taxpayers and the requirement for full-year tax returns. The decision also highlights the importance of understanding the legislative intent behind tax provisions, particularly those aimed at preventing tax advantages. Subsequent cases and IRS guidance may further refine or expand upon this ruling, but it remains a significant precedent for determining income averaging eligibility.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.