Nico v. Commissioner, 67 T. C. 647, 1977 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 169 (1977)

Dual-status aliens are ineligible to file joint returns or use the standard deduction in the year they change residency status.

Summary

In Nico v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that dual-status aliens, who are nonresident aliens for part of the year and resident aliens for another part, cannot file joint returns or use the standard deduction for the year of their status change. Severino and Teresita Nico, Filipino nationals who moved to the U. S. in 1971, argued for these tax benefits but were denied due to their dual status. The court also disallowed their moving expense deductions from Manila to San Francisco for failing to meet the 39-week employment requirement, and upheld the Commissioner's calculation of their moving expenses from San Francisco to New York City.

Facts

Severino and Teresita Nico, Philippine nationals, moved to the U. S. in April 1971. They initially stayed in San Francisco for four months, where both found employment, before moving to New York City in August 1971. They filed a joint federal income tax return for 1971, claiming moving expenses from Manila to San Francisco and from San Francisco to New York City, and used the standard deduction. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the joint filing, the standard deduction, and part of the moving expense deductions.

Procedural History

The Nicos petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to challenge the Commissioner's determinations. The court heard the case and issued its decision on January 10, 1977, affirming the Commissioner's position.

Issue(s)

1. Whether dual-status aliens are entitled to file a joint return for their year of entry into the United States?
2. Whether dual-status aliens are entitled to use the standard deduction for their year of entry into the United States?
3. Whether the Nicos are entitled to a deduction for their moving expenses incurred in their move from Manila, Philippines, to San Francisco, California?
4. Whether the Commissioner correctly computed the Nicos' deductions for moving expenses arising from their move from San Francisco to New York City?

Holding

1. No, because dual-status aliens are treated as having a full-year taxable period,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

and section 6013 prohibits joint filing if either spouse is a nonresident alien at any time during the taxable year.
2. No, because the court interpreted section 142 and the relevant regulations to preclude dual-status aliens from using the standard deduction, as they were nonresident aliens during part of the taxable year.
3. No, because San Francisco was considered their new principal place of work, and they failed to remain there for the required 39 weeks under section 217(c)(2).
4. Yes, because the Nicos failed to substantiate their claimed expenses for food, and the Commissioner's calculations were deemed reasonable.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied section 6013 to deny joint filing, as the Nicos were nonresident aliens for part of 1971, and section 142(b)(1) to deny the standard deduction, interpreting it in line with Revenue Rulings and regulations despite some ambiguity. The court determined that San Francisco was the Nicos' new principal place of work, not merely a stopover, thus disallowing the Manila to San Francisco moving expense deduction due to non-compliance with the 39-week employment requirement. For the San Francisco to New York City move, the court upheld the Commissioner's calculation of meal expenses due to lack of substantiation by the Nicos. The decision was influenced by the need for clear tax administration for dual-status aliens and the specific requirements of sections 217 and 142.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that dual-status aliens cannot file joint returns or use the standard deduction in the year they change their residency status, impacting how such taxpayers should approach their tax filings. It also emphasizes the importance of meeting the 39-week employment requirement for moving expense deductions, affecting how similar cases should be analyzed. Legal practitioners should advise clients on these tax implications when planning moves to the U. S. and ensure proper substantiation of moving expenses. This ruling may influence future cases involving dual-status aliens and their eligibility for tax deductions, reinforcing the need for careful tax planning and compliance with IRS regulations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.