Freedman v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 564 (1979)

The U. S. Tax Court lacks jurisdiction to redetermine deficiencies for certain excise taxes, including those imposed under section 1491 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In Freedman v. Commissioner, the Tax Court held it lacked jurisdiction to review an excise tax deficiency under section 1491 of the Internal Revenue Code. The case arose when the Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency for both income and excise taxes to the Freedmans, who contested the excise tax in Tax Court. The Court found that its jurisdiction, as defined by sections 6211 and 6212 of the Code, did not extend to the excise tax in question, which was not listed among the taxes subject to deficiency procedures. The decision underscores the importance of statutory language in defining the scope of the Tax Court's jurisdiction and emphasizes that such jurisdiction cannot be expanded by the actions of the parties.

Facts

Irving and Thelma Freedman, residents of Hollywood, Florida, sold I. O. S. , Ltd. , stock to their family trust in 1969. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that this transaction triggered an excise tax deficiency under section 1491 of the Internal Revenue Code, amounting to $122,872. On January 12, 1978, the Commissioner mailed notices of deficiency for both the excise tax and a related income tax deficiency of $112,831 for the year 1969. The Freedmans timely filed a petition with the Tax Court contesting both deficiencies. On June 7, 1978, the Commissioner moved to dismiss the portion of the petition related to the excise tax deficiency, arguing that the Tax Court lacked jurisdiction over it.

Procedural History

The Commissioner mailed the Freedmans notices of deficiency on January 12, 1978, for both the excise tax under section 1491 and an income tax deficiency. The Freedmans filed a timely petition with the U. S. Tax Court contesting both deficiencies. On June 7, 1978, the Commissioner filed a motion to dismiss the portion of the petition related to the excise tax deficiency, asserting that the Tax Court lacked jurisdiction over such taxes. The Tax Court granted the Commissioner's motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction regarding the excise tax deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction to redetermine an excise tax deficiency under section 1491 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because section 6211 of the Internal Revenue Code defines a “deficiency” in a way that excludes excise taxes imposed under section 1491, and the Tax Court’s jurisdiction is limited to those deficiencies as defined by statute.

Court’s Reasoning

The Court’s decision hinged on the interpretation of sections 6211 and 6212 of the Internal Revenue Code. Section 6211(a) defines a “deficiency” specifically for income, estate, gift, and certain excise taxes, but does not include the excise tax under section 1491. The Court emphasized that the Tax Court’s jurisdiction is strictly statutory and cannot be expanded beyond what is explicitly provided. The Court also noted that section 1494(a) mandates that the section 1491 tax be due and payable at the time of transfer without assessment or notice and demand, supporting a framework of expeditious assessment and collection not subject to Tax Court review. The Court rejected the argument that the Commissioner’s issuance of a notice of deficiency for the section 1491 tax could confer jurisdiction, stating that jurisdiction cannot be enlarged by the actions of the parties. The Court’s decision was further supported by the legislative history of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, which did not intend to alter the collection procedures for section 1491 taxes.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that the U. S. Tax Court does not have jurisdiction to review deficiencies in excise taxes under section 1491, which are intended to be collected expeditiously without the need for deficiency procedures. Practitioners must be aware that taxpayers contesting such excise taxes must seek relief through other avenues, such as administrative remedies or district court actions, rather than the Tax Court. The case also serves as a reminder that statutory definitions of “deficiency” and related jurisdictional provisions are strictly construed and cannot be expanded by the actions or notices of the parties involved. This ruling may impact how taxpayers and their attorneys approach disputes over excise taxes not subject to deficiency procedures, emphasizing the need for careful consideration of the appropriate venue for legal challenges.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.