Saso v. Commissioner, 95 T. C. 534 (1990)

The U. S. Tax Court lacks jurisdiction to redetermine deficiencies attributable to partnership items outside of a partnership-level proceeding, but retains jurisdiction over affected items determined at the partner level.

Summary

In Saso v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed its jurisdiction over deficiencies arising from partnership items. The case involved Martin Saso II and Kim J. Sealy, limited partners in Pepiot Mine, Ltd. , who challenged deficiencies and additions to tax assessed following adjustments to Pepiot's partnership returns. The IRS moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction regarding the partnership items. The court held that it lacked jurisdiction to redetermine the deficiencies related to partnership items, as these must be addressed at the partnership level, but retained jurisdiction over the affected items, such as additions to tax, which are determined at the partner level.

Facts

Martin Saso II and Kim J. Sealy were limited partners in Pepiot Mine, Ltd. , a mining venture. In April 1987, the IRS issued notices of final partnership administrative adjustment (FPAAs) for Pepiot's 1982 and 1983 tax years, disallowing certain deductions which resulted in deficiencies for the partners. No petition was filed against these FPAAs, leading to assessments of the deficiencies. In August 1988, the IRS issued a notice of deficiency to the petitioners for 1982, determining additions to tax based on the previously assessed partnership items. The petitioners filed a petition in the Tax Court challenging both the deficiencies from partnership items and the additions to tax.

Procedural History

The IRS moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction regarding the deficiencies attributable to partnership items and to strike the petitioners' claims related to these items. The case was heard by Special Trial Judge Peter J. Panuthos, whose opinion was adopted by the Tax Court. The court considered whether it had jurisdiction over the deficiencies and additions to tax.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction to redetermine deficiencies attributable to partnership items in response to a notice of deficiency determining additions to tax.
2. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction over the additions to tax determined in the notice of deficiency.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because under section 6221 et seq. , deficiencies attributable to partnership items must be determined at the partnership level, not in response to a notice of deficiency for additions to tax.
2. Yes, because the additions to tax are “affected items” that require factual determinations at the partner level, over which the Tax Court has jurisdiction.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the statutory framework of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, which mandates that partnership items be determined at the partnership level. The court cited section 6221, which states that “the tax treatment of any partnership item is generally determined at the partnership level. ” The court also referenced section 6231(a)(3) and the regulations defining “partnership items,” which included the disallowed deductions that led to the deficiencies. The court emphasized that since no petition was filed against the FPAAs, the IRS correctly assessed the deficiencies at the partnership level under section 6225(c). For the additions to tax, the court noted these were “affected items” as defined in section 6231(a)(5), which require partner-level determinations, thus falling within the Tax Court’s jurisdiction. The court dismissed the petitioners’ statute of limitations argument as a merits defense, not a jurisdictional issue, and found no jurisdiction over the 1983 tax year due to the absence of a notice of deficiency for that year.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that the Tax Court’s jurisdiction is limited to partner-level determinations for affected items, such as additions to tax, while partnership items must be addressed at the partnership level. Practitioners must ensure that challenges to partnership items are timely filed at the partnership level, or they risk losing the opportunity to contest these items. The ruling also emphasizes the importance of understanding the distinction between partnership items and affected items when navigating tax disputes. Subsequent cases have followed this framework, reinforcing the separation of partnership and partner-level proceedings. Businesses involved in partnerships should be aware of these procedural requirements to effectively manage tax assessments and disputes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.