

## ***Kaufman v. Commissioner, 82 T. C. 743 (1984)***

The 15% add-on minimum tax applies to fiscal year taxpayers whose tax year began in 1978, despite the enactment of the new alternative minimum tax for tax years beginning after 1978.

### **Summary**

In *Kaufman v. Commissioner*, the Tax Court ruled that the Kaufmans, with a fiscal year from August 1, 1978, to July 31, 1979, were subject to the 15% add-on minimum tax for their capital gains, despite the Revenue Act of 1978 introducing a new alternative minimum tax system for years beginning after 1978. The court clarified that the new tax regime did not apply to the Kaufmans' fiscal year, which started before the effective date of the new law. The decision was based on the clear statutory language and legislative intent, emphasizing that the 15% add-on tax remained applicable for fiscal years beginning in 1978.

### **Facts**

Ben S. and Natalie Kaufman resided in Redondo Beach, California, and filed their 1978 federal income tax return for the fiscal year from August 1, 1978, to July 31, 1979. They reported capital gains of \$217,802 and claimed a capital gains deduction of \$128,583. The Kaufmans calculated a capital gains tax-preference item of \$6,225 and reported zero minimum tax liability. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue recomputed their tax liability, determining a deficiency of \$15,422.27 due to the application of the 15% add-on minimum tax, which was still in effect for their fiscal year.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency to the Kaufmans, asserting they owed additional tax under the 15% add-on minimum tax regime. The Kaufmans petitioned the United States Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court, in a decision by Judge Goffe, held that the Kaufmans were subject to the 15% add-on tax for their fiscal year beginning in 1978 and ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether the Kaufmans, with a fiscal year beginning August 1, 1978, and ending July 31, 1979, are subject to the 15% add-on minimum tax for their capital gains?

### **Holding**

1. Yes, because the Revenue Act of 1978, which introduced the alternative minimum tax for years beginning after 1978, did not apply to the Kaufmans' fiscal year, which began in 1978.

## **Court's Reasoning**

The court's decision was based on the clear statutory language of the Revenue Act of 1978, which specified that the new alternative minimum tax applied to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1978. The Kaufmans' fiscal year, starting on August 1, 1978, fell outside this effective date. The court noted that the 15% add-on tax, in effect for 1978, continued to apply to fiscal years beginning in that year. The court also considered the legislative history, which explicitly stated that the new minimum tax would not apply until a taxpayer's fiscal year beginning in 1979. The court rejected the Kaufmans' argument for applying the proration provisions under section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, as these provisions did not apply to new taxes like the alternative minimum tax. The court cited the Senate and Conference Committee reports, which clarified that the new tax regime was not a change in the rate of tax but the introduction of a new tax, thus not subject to section 21 proration.

## **Practical Implications**

The Kaufman decision clarifies the application of the 15% add-on minimum tax for fiscal year taxpayers whose tax year began in 1978, despite the introduction of the alternative minimum tax for subsequent years. This ruling is significant for tax practitioners advising clients with fiscal years straddling major tax law changes. It underscores the importance of carefully reviewing the effective dates of new tax legislation and understanding how transitional rules apply to different taxpayers. The decision also highlights the need for clear statutory language and legislative history in interpreting tax law changes. Subsequent cases involving similar issues would need to consider the specific effective dates of tax law changes and whether they apply to the taxpayer's fiscal year. This case serves as a reminder of the complexities of tax law and the importance of accurate tax planning and compliance.