

Estate of Smith v. Commissioner, 110 T. C. 12 (1998)

Section 1341 relief is limited to amounts previously reported as income by the taxpayer who must repay those amounts.

Summary

In *Estate of Smith v. Commissioner*, the U. S. Tax Court addressed the application of Section 1341, which provides tax relief for repayments of income previously reported under a claim of right. The estate of Algerine Allen Smith had settled claims for overpaid royalties, originally reported by Smith and her deceased relatives. The court held that Section 1341 relief was restricted to the portion of the settlement that represented royalties previously reported by Smith herself, not those reported by her relatives. The court also clarified that the overpayment under Section 1341(b)(1) was not capped by the formula in that section. Additionally, the court denied the Commissioner's attempt to amend the answer to reduce the credit for state death taxes.

Facts

Algerine Allen Smith and her aunts, Jessamine and Frankie Allen, received royalties from oil and gas leases from 1975 to 1980. Smith inherited interests from Jessamine and Frankie upon their deaths in 1979 and 1989, respectively. Exxon later sued, claiming overpayment of royalties to Smith and her aunts, totaling \$1,032,317, with \$249,304 attributed to Smith. After Smith's death in 1990, her estate settled the claim for \$681,840 in 1992. Smith had reported \$284,180 in royalties on her tax returns from 1975 to 1980, with a 22% depletion allowance.

Procedural History

The estate filed a claim for a Section 1341 deduction on its 1992 tax return. The Tax Court initially held that the estate was entitled to an overpayment of income tax under Section 1341, which was includable in the taxable estate. Upon further disagreement on computational methods, the court issued a supplemental opinion addressing the proper calculation of the overpayment and the Commissioner's motion to amend the answer regarding the credit for state death taxes.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the entire settlement payment of \$681,840 can be used to reduce royalty income previously reported by Smith under Section 1341?
2. Whether the overpayment under Section 1341(b)(1) is limited to the amount computed under that section?
3. Whether the Commissioner can amend the answer to reduce the credit for state death taxes?

Holding

1. No, because Section 1341 relief is restricted to the portion of the settlement that represents royalties previously received and reported by Smith herself, which was calculated as 24% of the settlement or \$163,641.
2. No, because Section 1341(b)(1) does not limit the overpayment to the amount computed under that section; it merely provides a method for treating the excess as an overpayment.
3. No, because Rule 155(c) prohibits raising new issues during computation proceedings, and the credit for state death taxes was previously uncontested.

Court's Reasoning

The court interpreted Section 1341 to apply only to items of income previously received and reported by the taxpayer who must repay them. The court used Exxon's allocation of its claims to determine that 24% of the settlement should be attributed to Smith's previously reported royalties. The court rejected the Commissioner's assumption that Smith received more royalties than reported and clarified that the overpayment under Section 1341(b)(1) is not capped by the formula in that section. Finally, the court found that Rule 155(c) barred the Commissioner from amending the answer to reduce the credit for state death taxes.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that Section 1341 relief is limited to the taxpayer's own previously reported income, impacting how estates and individuals calculate repayments of income under claim of right. It also affects the IRS's ability to adjust credits during computation proceedings. Practitioners should carefully allocate settlement payments to ensure accurate application of Section 1341, and be aware that overpayments under this section are not automatically limited by Section 1341(b)(1). The ruling also reinforces the procedural limitations on amending answers during computational stages, which could influence how tax disputes are strategized.