Barrett v. Commissioner, 96 T. C. 713 (1991)

A taxpayer may claim a credit under section 1341 for the tax year in which a settlement payment is made if the payment establishes that the taxpayer did not have an unrestricted right to income previously reported under the claim-of-right doctrine.

Summary

In Barrett v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that a taxpayer who settled a lawsuit by repaying part of his profit from stock options trading could claim a credit under section 1341 of the Internal Revenue Code. Joseph Barrett had reported the profit as short-term capital gain in 1981 but settled a lawsuit in 1984 by repaying $54,400. The court held that the settlement established Barrett did not have an unrestricted right to the income, thus qualifying him for the credit. However, the court disallowed a deduction for legal fees incurred in the litigation, requiring them to be capitalized as they were related to a capital transaction.

Facts

In 1981, Joseph Barrett, a stockbroker, purchased and sold options based on advice from a broker at his firm, realizing a short-term capital gain of $187,223. 39. The SEC investigated him for insider trading, and civil lawsuits were filed against him and others for $10 million. In 1984, Barrett settled the lawsuits by paying $54,400, and the SEC dropped its charges. Barrett also incurred $17,721. 79 in legal fees related to the SEC investigation and civil lawsuits.

Procedural History

Barrett claimed a business expense deduction for the $54,400 settlement payment on his 1984 tax return, which was disallowed by the IRS. The Tax Court reviewed the case and held that Barrett was entitled to a credit under section 1341 but not a deduction for the legal fees, which must be capitalized.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Barrett is entitled to a credit under section 1341(a)(5) for 1984 equal to the decrease in his 1981 tax liability attributable to the exclusion of $54,400 from 1981 gross income.
2. Whether Barrett is entitled to a deduction under sections 162 or 212 for the $17,721. 79 in legal fees paid in 1984.

Holding

1. Yes, because the settlement payment established that Barrett did not have an unrestricted right to the $54,400 he reported as income in 1981, qualifying him for a section 1341(a)(5) credit.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the legal fees were incurred in connection with a capital transaction and must be capitalized rather than deducted under sections 162 or 212.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the claim-of-right doctrine, which requires taxpayers to report income received under a claim of right, even if they may later be required to restore it. Section 1341 provides relief by allowing a credit if the taxpayer restores the income in a subsequent year. The court found that the settlement payment was not voluntary but based on a legal obligation, as evidenced by the SEC’s proceedings and the civil lawsuits. The settlement established Barrett’s obligation to restore the income, satisfying section 1341(a)(2). The court rejected the IRS’s argument that the settlement must be a judgment to establish the obligation, citing cases like Lyeth v. Hoey, which treat settlements similarly to judgments for tax purposes. Regarding the legal fees, the court applied the Woodward rule, focusing on the origin of the claim (a capital transaction) rather than the purpose of the litigation, concluding the fees must be capitalized.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that settlements can establish a legal obligation for purposes of the claim-of-right doctrine, allowing taxpayers to claim section 1341 credits without a formal judgment. It reinforces the importance of analyzing the origin of a claim in determining whether legal fees should be deducted or capitalized. Practitioners should advise clients to consider section 1341 relief when settling disputes over previously reported income. The ruling also impacts how legal fees are treated, requiring careful consideration of whether they relate to capital transactions. Subsequent cases have applied this reasoning to similar settlement situations, but the treatment of legal fees remains a contentious issue.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.