

## ***Pacific First Federal Savings Bank v. Commissioner, 94 T. C. 101 (1990)***

Taxable income for calculating deductions under the percentage of taxable income method must not be adjusted for net operating loss carrybacks when such adjustments are not explicitly provided for by statute.

### **Summary**

Pacific First Federal Savings Bank deducted additions to its bad debt reserve based on a percentage of taxable income from 1971 to 1980. The bank incurred net operating losses (NOLs) in 1981 and 1982, which it sought to carry back to earlier years. The Commissioner argued that the NOL carrybacks should reduce the bank's taxable income before calculating the bad debt reserve deduction, as per the Treasury regulations. The Tax Court invalidated the regulation, holding that Congress did not intend NOL carrybacks to affect the calculation of the deduction, preserving the bank's original deduction amounts and allowing for a larger NOL carryforward.

### **Facts**

Pacific First Federal Savings Bank deducted additions to its bad debt reserve from 1971 to 1980, using the percentage of taxable income method as allowed by section 593(b)(2)(A). In 1981 and 1982, the bank incurred significant net operating losses (NOLs), which it sought to carry back under section 172(b)(1)(F) to offset income from earlier years. The Commissioner argued that the NOL carrybacks should reduce the taxable income base used for calculating the bad debt reserve deductions for the carryback years, thereby reducing the deductions and increasing the taxable income absorbed by the NOLs.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency to Pacific First Federal Savings Bank for the tax years 1978, 1979, and 1980, asserting that the bank's NOL carrybacks should have reduced the taxable income used to calculate its bad debt reserve deductions. The bank petitioned the United States Tax Court, challenging the validity of the Treasury regulation that required taxable income to reflect NOL carrybacks before calculating the deduction.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether subdivisions (vi) and (vii) of section 1.593-6A(b)(5), Income Tax Regs., are valid to the extent they require that taxable income reflect NOL carrybacks before calculating the deduction for addition to bad debt reserve.

### **Holding**

1. No, because the regulations were inconsistent with Congressional intent and

statutory language, which did not explicitly require that NOL carrybacks reduce taxable income for the purpose of calculating the bad debt reserve deduction.

### **Court's Reasoning**

The Tax Court invalidated the regulation on the grounds that it did not harmonize with the plain language, origin, and purpose of section 593. The court found that Congress intended to encourage mutual institutions to maintain ample reserves while gradually increasing their tax liability, and the challenged regulation contradicted this intent by reducing the value of NOL carrybacks and increasing the effective tax rate beyond Congress's intended limits. The court emphasized that the legislative history indicated Congress was aware of and relied upon the prior regulatory framework when amending section 593 in 1969. The court also noted the long-standing administrative practice of disregarding NOL carrybacks when calculating the deduction, which further supported its decision.

### **Practical Implications**

This decision reinforces the importance of adhering to the statutory language and Congressional intent when interpreting regulations. For legal practitioners, it underscores the need to scrutinize regulations against statutory provisions, particularly when they affect deductions and carrybacks. Financial institutions can continue to calculate their bad debt reserve deductions without adjusting for NOL carrybacks, unless explicitly required by statute, potentially leading to larger carryforward amounts of NOLs. The ruling also highlights the significance of administrative consistency and the potential invalidity of regulations that deviate from long-standing interpretations without clear statutory support. Subsequent cases, such as *The Home Group, Inc. v. Commissioner*, have cited this decision when addressing similar issues of deduction calculations and NOL carrybacks.