

## ***Landry v. Commissioner, 116 T. C. 60 (U. S. Tax Court 2001)***

In *Landry v. Commissioner*, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that Eugene M. Landry could not apply overpayments from late-filed tax returns to offset his tax liabilities due to the three-year statutory limitation under IRC §6511(b). The court upheld the IRS's decision to proceed with collection actions, emphasizing the strict enforcement of tax filing deadlines and the non-application of equitable arguments in tax law.

### **Parties**

Eugene M. Landry, Petitioner, pro se, versus Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, represented by John D. Faucher.

### **Facts**

Eugene M. Landry, a resident of Spring, Texas, was employed as a staff financial representative for Royal Dutch Shell Group. He filed joint tax returns with his wife, Deborah B. Landry, from 1989 through 1998. Landry consistently filed his tax returns late, with the 1989 return filed on April 15, 1993, and subsequent returns filed between April 1997 and April 1999. Each return reported an overpayment, which Landry elected to apply to subsequent years' estimated tax liabilities. The IRS applied the overpayments as directed by Landry, except where the overpayments were claimed more than three years after they were deemed paid, which barred their application under IRC §6511(b).

### **Procedural History**

The IRS sent Landry a Notice of Determination Concerning Collection Action(s) under IRC §§6320 and 6330 for his 1992 and 1996 tax liabilities. Landry contested the proposed levy, arguing that his tax liabilities were paid through excess withholding from earlier years. The IRS declined to apply the excess withholding from years for which returns were filed more than three years late. Landry filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court, challenging the IRS's determination. The court conducted a de novo review of the case under IRC §6330(d)(1).

### **Issue(s)**

Whether the U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction over the case given the absence of a determined deficiency, and whether Landry is entitled to apply overpayments from returns filed more than three years late to offset his tax liabilities under IRC §6511(b).

### **Rule(s) of Law**

IRC §6330(d)(1) grants the U. S. Tax Court jurisdiction over cases involving federal income taxes. IRC §6511(b) limits the time for filing claims for refunds or credits to three years from the time the tax was paid. IRC §6513(b)(1) and (b)(2) specify the

deemed payment dates for withheld taxes and estimated tax payments, respectively.

## **Holding**

No, because the U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction over federal income tax matters under IRC §6330(d)(1), regardless of whether a deficiency was determined. No, because Landry is not entitled to apply overpayments from returns filed more than three years late to offset his tax liabilities, as such claims are barred under IRC §6511(b).

## **Reasoning**

The court's jurisdiction over the case was established under IRC §6330(d)(1), as the underlying tax liability related to federal income taxes. The court rejected Landry's equitable argument, noting his deliberate decision not to file returns until the three-year window for claiming refunds or credits was about to pass, and his subsequent failure to meet this deadline due to personal and professional obligations. The court emphasized the strict statutory limitation under IRC §6511(b), which bars claims for refunds or credits filed more than three years after the tax was paid. The court also applied IRC §6513(b)(1) and (b)(2) to determine the deemed payment dates for withheld taxes and estimated tax payments, respectively, concluding that Landry's claims for overpayments were indeed time-barred. The court's decision was supported by precedent, including *United States v. Brockamp*, which upheld the strict enforcement of statutory deadlines for tax refunds and credits.

## **Disposition**

The court entered a decision for the respondent, affirming the IRS's determination that collection efforts should proceed against Landry's tax liabilities for 1992 and 1996.

## **Significance/Impact**

Landry v. Commissioner reinforces the strict application of statutory limitations on claims for tax refunds and credits under IRC §6511(b). The case highlights the importance of timely filing tax returns to preserve the right to apply overpayments to future liabilities. It also underscores the limited role of equitable arguments in tax law, emphasizing the need for taxpayers to adhere to statutory deadlines. Subsequent cases have cited Landry to support the enforcement of statutory time limits in tax matters, impacting both individual taxpayers and tax practitioners in their approach to tax planning and compliance.