Howell v. Commissioner, 77 T. C. 916 (1981)

Amendments to tax laws may be applied retroactively to pending cases where the tax has not yet been assessed, provided the retroactivity does not violate due process.

Summary

In Howell v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether amendments to the Internal Revenue Code, specifically those correcting jurisdictional defects in second-tier excise taxes, could be applied to a case pending before the court. The court ruled that these amendments, enacted on December 24, 1980, could apply to Howell's case because the taxes in question had not been assessed at the time of the amendment's enactment. The decision hinged on the interpretation of the term "assessed" in the amendment's effective date provision, which the court interpreted to mean that the taxes could still be assessed post-amendment. The court found no due process violation in this retroactive application, as the taxes were subject to existing law at the time of the acts in question.

Facts

On May 14, 1980, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue mailed Rosemary Howell a notice of deficiency determining first and second-tier excise taxes for acts of self-dealing in 1973, 1974, and 1975. Howell filed a petition on October 14, 1980, contesting these determinations. On December 24, 1980, the Second Tier Tax Correction Act was enacted, correcting the jurisdictional defects in the second-tier tax provisions that the Tax Court had previously identified in Adams v. Commissioner (1979). Howell moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction over the second-tier taxes, arguing that the amendments should not apply retroactively to her case.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially heard the case on Howell's motion to dismiss, filed on December 8, 1980. The court conducted a hearing on January 21, 1981, and took the motion under advisement. On October 22, 1981, the court issued its opinion, denying Howell's motion to dismiss based on the applicability of the 1980 amendments to her case.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by the Second Tier Tax Correction Act of 1980 apply to cases pending in the Tax Court where the notice of deficiency was mailed before the amendment's enactment but the taxes have not been assessed.
2. Whether the retroactive application of these amendments violates due process.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the taxes in question had not been assessed before the enactment of the amendments, and the doctrine of res judicata did not apply as the case had not yet been tried and decided on its merits.
2. No, because the retroactive application of the amendments does not violate due process as it merely corrects procedural defects in the administration of existing taxes.

Court’s Reasoning

The court interpreted the effective date of the amendments to apply to “taxes assessed after the date of enactment,” which in Howell’s case meant that the second-tier taxes could still be assessed because the case was pending and no assessment had been made. The court rejected Howell’s argument that the amendments should not apply because the notice of deficiency was mailed before the enactment, distinguishing between the mailing of the notice and the actual assessment of the tax. The court also relied on legislative history indicating that Congress intended the amendments to apply to pending cases to ensure the collection of second-tier taxes. The court found no due process violation, as the amendments were technical corrections to existing law rather than the imposition of new taxes.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that amendments to tax laws can apply retroactively to pending cases if the tax in question has not been assessed, provided the retroactivity does not impose new liabilities or violate due process. Practitioners should be aware that the timing of tax assessments can impact the applicability of new tax legislation to their clients’ cases. This ruling also reaffirms the principle that retroactive tax amendments are constitutional when they are curative and do not impose new taxes. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, applying amendments to pending cases where no final assessment had been made, thereby ensuring that the tax system can be corrected without unfairly penalizing taxpayers.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.