Crop Associates-1986 v. Commissioner, T. C. Memo. 1999-247

The defense of equitable recoupment cannot be considered in a partnership-level proceeding under subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In Crop Associates-1986 v. Commissioner, the Tax Court denied a motion to amend a petition to include the affirmative defense of equitable recoupment in a partnership-level proceeding. The partnership sought to challenge the disallowance of a 1986 farming expense deduction and its offsetting 1987 income. The court held that equitable recoupment, which involves partner-level determinations, was not appropriate in a partnership-level proceeding under subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code. The court also found that allowing the amendment would unfairly prejudice the Commissioner due to the timing and complexity of the new issues raised.

Facts

Crop Associates-1986, a limited partnership, filed a petition challenging the disallowance of a farming expense deduction for 1986. The partnership also reported the same amount as income in 1987. Frederick H. Behrens, the tax matters partner, intervened and moved to amend the petition to include the defense of equitable recoupment. This defense was based on the argument that the 1986 deduction and 1987 income arose from a single transaction, which was subject to inconsistent tax treatment. The Commissioner objected to the amendment, arguing that equitable recoupment was not a partnership item and should not be considered in this proceeding.

Procedural History

The petition was filed by a partner other than the tax matters partner. Behrens was allowed to intervene and subsequently moved for leave to amend the petition to add the defense of equitable recoupment. The Commissioner opposed the motion, leading to the Tax Court’s review and ultimate denial of the motion to amend.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the defense of equitable recoupment can be raised in a partnership-level proceeding under subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the Commissioner would be substantially disadvantaged by allowing the amendment to the petition.

Holding

1. No, because equitable recoupment requires partner-level determinations, which are beyond the jurisdiction of the Tax Court in a partnership-level proceeding under

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

section 6226(f).
2. Yes, because allowing the amendment would surprise and substantially disadvantage the Commissioner due to the timing and complexity of the issues raised.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that equitable recoupment is not a partnership item under section 6231(a)(3) and thus cannot be considered in a partnership-level proceeding under section 6226(f). The court noted that equitable recoupment involves partner-level determinations, such as whether a partner made a time-barred overpayment, which are outside the court's jurisdiction in a partnership-level case. The court also considered the Commissioner's argument that equitable recoupment is an affected item requiring partner-level determinations, further supporting the inappropriateness of considering it at the partnership level. Additionally, the court found that allowing the amendment would prejudice the Commissioner due to the late timing of the motion and the complexity of gathering evidence for the new issues raised. The court emphasized that justice does not require leave to amend a pleading when it would surprise and substantially disadvantage an adverse party.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that the defense of equitable recoupment cannot be raised in partnership-level proceedings under subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code. Attorneys representing partnerships must be aware that such defenses are only appropriate at the partner level, typically after a computational adjustment and issuance of a deficiency notice. The ruling underscores the importance of timely raising all relevant defenses in tax litigation to avoid prejudicing the opposing party. Practitioners should also note that the court's jurisdiction in partnership-level proceedings is strictly limited to partnership items, and attempts to include partner-level issues may be rejected. This case may influence how partnerships structure their defenses and the timing of raising equitable recoupment in tax disputes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.