Terzian v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 1198 (1979)

An innocent spouse may be relieved of joint tax liability if they did not know and had no reason to know of the omitted income, and it would be inequitable to hold them liable, considering all circumstances including benefits received.

Summary

In Terzian v. Commissioner, Margaret Terzian sought relief from joint tax liability under Section 6013(e) after her husband, Dr. Terzian, omitted substantial income from their joint returns. The court found that Margaret did not know of the omissions and had no reason to know, given her husband's complete control over financial matters. Despite receiving a large sum of money post-separation, the court determined this was for her ordinary support and not a significant benefit from the omitted income. Thus, Margaret qualified as an innocent spouse, highlighting the importance of equitable considerations and the spouse's knowledge in such cases.

Facts

Margaret Terzian filed joint federal income tax returns with her husband, Dr. Peter Terzian, for the years 1969 through 1971. Dr. Terzian, a physician, managed all family finances and omitted significant income from their tax returns, leading to deficiencies assessed by the IRS. Margaret, a former teacher, was unaware of these omissions as she signed the returns without reviewing them. Dr. Terzian was convicted of tax evasion for 1968. After their separation, Dr. Terzian transferred $155,000 to Margaret from a joint bank account, which she used for living expenses. Margaret sought innocent spouse relief under Section 6013(e).

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in the Terzians' tax returns for 1969, 1970, and 1971, and Margaret petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for relief as an innocent spouse. The Tax Court heard the case and issued its decision in 1979.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Margaret Terzian, when signing the joint tax returns, did not know and had no reason to know of the omitted income.
2. Whether Margaret Terzian significantly benefited from the omitted income, making it equitable to hold her liable for the tax deficiency.

Holding

1. Yes, because Margaret did not know of the omitted income and had no reason to know, given her husband's complete control over financial matters and her lack of involvement.
2. No, because the $155,000 transferred to Margaret was deemed to be for her

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

ordinary support and not a significant benefit from the omitted income, making it inequitable to hold her liable.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 6013(e) to determine Margaret’s eligibility for innocent spouse relief. It found that the omitted income exceeded 25% of the gross income reported, satisfying the first condition. For the second condition, the court determined that Margaret did not know of the omissions and had no reason to know, as she signed the returns without reviewing them and Dr. Terzian controlled all financial matters. The court emphasized the standard of whether a reasonable person under similar circumstances could be expected to know of the omission. On the third condition, the court considered whether Margaret significantly benefited from the omitted income. It concluded that the $155,000 transfer was for her ordinary support, not a significant benefit, and thus it would be inequitable to hold her liable. The court referenced the Senate Finance Committee report and IRS regulations to support its interpretation of “benefit. “

Practical Implications

Terzian v. Commissioner sets a precedent for assessing innocent spouse relief under Section 6013(e). It emphasizes the importance of the spouse’s knowledge and involvement in financial matters when determining relief eligibility. Legal practitioners should advise clients on the significance of reviewing joint tax returns and understanding their financial situation. The case also highlights the court’s consideration of equitable factors, such as the nature of benefits received post-separation, in determining liability. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling to similar situations, reinforcing the criteria for innocent spouse relief. This decision impacts how tax professionals and courts approach joint tax liability disputes, particularly in cases of financial dominance by one spouse.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.