Russo v. Commissioner, 98 T. C. 28 (1992)

A claim for innocent spouse relief must be timely raised and the underlying deductions must be grossly erroneous to qualify for relief.

Summary

In Russo v. Commissioner, Andrea Russo sought to amend a petition to claim innocent spouse relief after eight years of litigation concerning tax deficiencies from London Options commodity straddles. The Tax Court denied her motion, citing its untimeliness and the fact that the deductions in question were not 'grossly erroneous' under IRC section 6013(e)(2). The court emphasized that deductions disallowed due to lack of legal basis under the Gregory v. Helvering doctrine do not necessarily qualify as 'grossly erroneous. ' This decision highlights the importance of timely raising claims and the strict criteria for innocent spouse relief.

Facts

Aaron and Andrea Russo filed a joint tax return reporting losses from a London Options commodity straddle investment. The IRS issued a deficiency notice, and the Russos filed a petition in Tax Court in 1983. After the London Options issue was settled and affirmed by multiple Courts of Appeals, Andrea Russo, through new counsel, sought to amend the petition in 1991 to claim innocent spouse relief, asserting she was unaware of the investment and its tax implications.

Procedural History

The Russos filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court in 1983. After the London Options issue was resolved against them, Andrea Russo moved to amend the petition in 1991 to claim innocent spouse relief. The Tax Court denied her motion.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Andrea Russo's motion to amend the petition to assert an innocent spouse claim should be granted despite being raised after the case had been ongoing for eight years?
2. Whether the deductions from the London Options investment qualify as 'grossly erroneous' under IRC section 6013(e)(2)?

Holding

1. No, because the motion was untimely raised, and allowing the amendment would unfairly burden the respondent after such a long period without mention of innocent spouse relief.
2. No, because the deductions, while disallowed, were not 'grossly erroneous' as they had a basis in law, having been initially sanctioned by IRS private letter rulings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that Andrea Russo’s motion to amend was untimely, as it was raised eight years after the initial petition and after all other issues had been settled. The court applied Rule 41(a), which allows amendments only by consent or leave of court, and found that granting the amendment would be unjust to the respondent. Additionally, the court determined that the London Options deductions were not ‘grossly erroneous’ under IRC section 6013(e)(2). The court cited Douglas v. Commissioner, explaining that a deduction must be frivolous, fraudulent, or phony to be considered grossly erroneous. The London Options deductions, while ultimately disallowed under the Gregory v. Helvering doctrine, had a basis in law due to initial IRS approval, thus not meeting the ‘grossly erroneous’ standard. The court also expressed concern over the potential dilatory nature of the motion and warned of possible sanctions for future similar actions.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of timely raising claims for innocent spouse relief. Practitioners must be aware that such claims, if not asserted early in litigation, may be denied on procedural grounds. Additionally, the case clarifies that deductions disallowed due to legal interpretation rather than being completely baseless do not qualify as ‘grossly erroneous’ for innocent spouse relief. This ruling may affect how tax attorneys advise clients on the timing and merits of innocent spouse claims. It also serves as a reminder to courts and practitioners to be vigilant about potentially dilatory tactics in tax litigation. Subsequent cases have cited Russo for its standards on the timeliness and substance of innocent spouse claims.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.