Silas v. Cross, 98 T. C. 613, 1992 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 44, 98 T. C. No. 41 (1992)

An Indian reservation within the United States does not qualify as 'outside the United States' for extending the time to file a tax deficiency petition.

Summary

In Silas v. Cross, the U. S. Tax Court addressed whether a Native American living on the Puyallup Indian Reservation could benefit from the extended 150-day filing period for tax deficiency petitions, typically reserved for those outside the U. S. The court held that despite the reservation's claim to sovereignty, its location within Washington State meant the standard 90-day filing period applied. Consequently, the petitioner's filing, which occurred 97 days after receiving the notice, was deemed untimely, and the case was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. This decision underscores the importance of geographic location over political sovereignty in determining applicable tax deadlines.

Facts

The petitioner, a member of the Puyallup Indian Nation, received a notice of deficiency from the IRS on August 8, 1990, at his address on the Puyallup Indian Reservation in Washington State. He filed a petition with the Tax Court on November 13, 1990, which was 97 days after the notice was mailed. The petitioner argued that the reservation's status as an independent sovereign nation should entitle him to the 150-day filing period provided for those outside the United States.

Procedural History

The IRS moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction, citing the petition's untimeliness. The petitioner filed a response, asserting the reservation's sovereign status and requesting an extended filing period. The case was assigned to a Special Trial Judge, who recommended dismissal due to the untimely filing, a recommendation the full Tax Court adopted.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Puyallup Indian Reservation, located within the United States, qualifies as 'outside the United States' under section 6213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, thus entitling the petitioner to a 150-day period to file a petition for redetermination of a tax deficiency.

Holding

1. No, because the Puyallup Indian Reservation is geographically located within the United States, specifically within Washington State, and thus does not fall under the extended filing period provided for notices addressed to persons outside the United

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

States.

Court’s Reasoning

The court’s reasoning focused on the geographical interpretation of ‘outside the United States’ as defined in section 7701(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code. The legislative history of section 6213(a) indicated that the extended filing period was intended to address logistical challenges for taxpayers in remote locations, such as Hawaii and Alaska before they became states. The court noted that the Puyallup Indian Reservation, despite any claims of sovereignty, is situated within the mainland United States and therefore does not face the same logistical challenges. The court emphasized that the petitioner had the same access to the U. S. Postal Service as any other U. S. resident, and thus, the standard 90-day filing period applied. The court also referenced the 1976 amendment to section 6213(a), which clarified that ‘United States’ in this context was meant geographically, not politically.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for Native Americans living on reservations within the United States, clarifying that they must adhere to the standard 90-day filing period for tax deficiency petitions. It reinforces the principle that geographical location, rather than political sovereignty, determines the applicable filing period under section 6213(a). Practitioners should advise clients on Indian reservations of this requirement to avoid jurisdictional dismissals. The ruling also underscores the importance of understanding the legislative intent behind tax statutes, which in this case was to alleviate logistical hardships, not to extend filing periods based on sovereignty claims. Subsequent cases involving similar issues have consistently applied this geographical interpretation, further solidifying its precedent.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.