Flynn v. Commissioner, 90 T. C. 363 (1988)

Increases in a shareholder's gross income from a subchapter S corporation are considered grossly erroneous items for innocent spouse relief, whereas disallowed deductions must be proven to have no basis in fact or law.

Summary

In Flynn v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed the characterization of adjustments to a taxpayer's income resulting from disallowed costs and deductions claimed by subchapter S corporations. The petitioner sought innocent spouse relief from tax deficiencies attributed to her husband's business activities. The court held that increases in gross income from the S corporations were grossly erroneous items, qualifying for relief, while disallowed loss deductions did not meet the criteria without proof of lacking basis in fact or law. This ruling clarifies the application of innocent spouse provisions to subchapter S corporations, affecting how similar cases should be analyzed and resolved.

Facts

Petitioner, a resident of Kingston, Pennsylvania, and her then-husband, Martin R. Flynn, filed joint federal income tax returns for the years 1974, 1975, and 1976. Mr. Flynn was a 50-percent shareholder in two subchapter S corporations, Tom Flynn Corp. (TFC) and River Corp. (River). The IRS disallowed certain costs and deductions claimed by these corporations, resulting in increased income and decreased loss deductions on the Flynns' returns. Petitioner was unaware of the business operations and did not participate in the corporations' affairs. She sought innocent spouse relief from the resulting tax deficiencies.

Procedural History

The case was initially filed in the U. S. Tax Court. The IRS conceded that the petitioner was not liable for additions to tax under section 6653(a) but contested her eligibility for innocent spouse relief under section 6013(e). The Tax Court reviewed the case and issued its opinion in 1988, focusing on the characterization of adjustments from subchapter S corporations for innocent spouse relief.

Issue(s)

1. Whether increases in a shareholder's gross income from a subchapter S corporation are considered grossly erroneous items under section 6013(e)?
2. Whether disallowed loss deductions from a subchapter S corporation are considered grossly erroneous items under section 6013(e)?

Holding

1. Yes, because a positive increase in a shareholder's income from a subchapter S

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

corporation is an item of omitted gross income, qualifying as a grossly erroneous item.
2. No, because disallowed loss deductions are not automatically considered grossly erroneous; the petitioner must prove they had no basis in fact or law.

Court’s Reasoning

The court analyzed the innocent spouse provisions under section 6013(e) and the treatment of subchapter S corporations. For the years in issue, the court determined that adjustments arising from disallowed costs and deductions are characterized at the shareholder level, not the corporate level. The court relied on the plain reading of section 6013(e) and legislative history, concluding that increases in gross income from the S corporations were grossly erroneous items, while disallowed loss deductions required proof of lacking basis in fact or law. The court emphasized that petitioner’s lack of knowledge and non-involvement in the business affairs supported her claim for relief from the gross income increases but not from the disallowed deductions without further proof.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how innocent spouse relief is applied to tax adjustments from subchapter S corporations. Practitioners should note that increases in gross income from such entities are automatically considered grossly erroneous, simplifying relief claims. However, disallowed deductions require a higher burden of proof, necessitating evidence that they lack any basis in fact or law. This ruling influences legal practice in tax law, particularly in cases involving joint filers and subchapter S corporations. It also affects how businesses structure their operations and how spouses manage their financial involvement to mitigate potential tax liabilities. Subsequent cases have referenced Flynn to clarify the application of innocent spouse provisions in similar contexts.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.