Molasky v. Commissioner, T. C. Memo. 1988-173

New issues cannot be raised during Tax Court Rule 155 computations if they were not addressed in pleadings or at trial.

Summary

In Molasky v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether petitioners could use income averaging to reduce their tax deficiency for 1981. The petitioners attempted to introduce this issue during the computation of the deficiency under Rule 155, after the trial had concluded. The court ruled against them, holding that income averaging was a new issue not previously raised and thus prohibited under Rule 155(c). The decision reinforces that Rule 155 computations are limited to the issues already decided by the court, preventing parties from introducing new matters at this stage.

Facts

Allan Molasky received $354,200 in 1981, part of which was allocated to a covenant not to compete. The Tax Court determined that $324,000 of this amount was taxable to the petitioners. After the trial, during the Rule 155 computations for determining the deficiency, the petitioners attempted to apply income averaging to their 1981 income based on their income from 1977 through 1980. They claimed zero taxable income for 1977 and 1978 but did not provide supporting documentation, stating they did not have their tax returns for those years.

Procedural History

The case was tried on June 11, 1987, focusing solely on the taxability of payments related to a covenant not to compete. On April 25, 1988, the Tax Court issued its opinion, holding that $324,000 of the payment was taxable. Following this, the parties could not agree on the computation of the deficiency, leading to the filing of computations by the respondent on June 22, 1988, and by the petitioners on July 25, 1988, with the petitioners introducing income averaging as a new issue.

Issue(s)

1. Whether petitioners could raise the issue of income averaging for the first time during Rule 155 computations.

Holding

1. No, because the issue of income averaging was a new issue not previously raised in pleadings or at trial, and thus prohibited under Rule 155(c).

Court’s Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court’s decision hinged on the interpretation of Rule 155(c), which limits arguments to the computation of the deficiency based on the court’s prior findings and conclusions, explicitly prohibiting new issues or retrial. The petitioners’ claim for income averaging was considered a new issue because it had not been raised in the pleadings, at trial, or discussed in the court’s prior opinion. Furthermore, the court emphasized that even if the issue had been raised at trial, it could not have been decided due to the lack of evidentiary support for the petitioners’ income in the preceding years. The court cited Cloes v. Commissioner and Estate of Papson v. Commissioner to support its position that Rule 155 computations are not an opportunity for relitigation or the introduction of new issues.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of raising all relevant issues in pleadings and at trial in Tax Court cases. It clarifies that Rule 155 computations are strictly for calculating the deficiency based on issues already decided, not for introducing new arguments. Practitioners must be diligent in presenting all potential defenses and claims at the earliest possible stage to avoid being barred from raising them later. This case also serves as a reminder of the need for proper documentation and evidence to support tax positions, especially when relying on historical income data. Subsequent cases have cited Molasky to reinforce the limits of Rule 155 proceedings, affecting how tax disputes are litigated and resolved.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.