Mora v. Comm'r, 117 T. C. 279 (U. S. Tax Ct. 2001)

In Mora v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court clarified the application of I. R. C. § 6015 for relief from joint and several tax liability. Patricia Mora sought relief from tax deficiencies arising from her ex-husband's tax shelter investment, which they claimed on joint returns. The court denied relief under § 6015(b) due to Mora's reason to know of the understatement but granted partial relief under § 6015(c), attributing the deficiency to her ex-husband's activities. This ruling delineates the criteria for 'actual knowledge' and 'tax benefit' in determining liability allocation, impacting how such cases are approached in future tax disputes.

Parties

Patricia M. Mora, f. k. a. Patricia Raspberry, was the petitioner. Lynn Raspberry was the intervenor, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was the respondent. At the trial level, Mora was the petitioner, and at the appeal level, Raspberry intervened.

Facts

Patricia M. Mora and Lynn Raspberry were married in 1984 and filed joint federal income tax returns for 1985 and 1986. Raspberry invested in a tax shelter limited partnership, Shorthorn Genetic Engineering 1983-2, Ltd. , managed by Hoyt Investments, which passed through substantial losses claimed on their joint returns. Mora had little involvement with the Hoyt organization and trusted Raspberry to handle their tax affairs. The Hoyt organization prepared their returns, which included significant deductions from the partnership. After their 1987 divorce, the IRS disallowed the partnership losses, resulting in tax deficiencies. Mora sought relief from joint and several liability under I. R. C. § 6015.

Procedural History

Mora filed a Form 8857 with the IRS requesting relief from joint and several liability, which was denied on February 23, 2000. She then filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court on May 23, 2000, for redetermination of relief under I. R. C. § 6015. Raspberry intervened on September 19, 2000, to oppose Mora's request for relief. The Tax Court reviewed the case de novo and applied the standard of review as required by the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Patricia Mora is entitled to relief from joint and several liability under I. R. C. § 6015(b) based on her lack of knowledge of the understatement on the joint returns?
2. Whether Patricia Mora is entitled to relief from joint and several liability under I. R. C. § 6015(c) based on the allocation of the deficiency to her ex-husband's activities and her lack of actual knowledge of the items giving rise to the deficiency?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

3. Whether Patricia Mora's relief under I. R. C. § 6015(c) is limited by the tax benefit she received from the disallowed deductions?

Rule(s) of Law

1. I. R. C. § 6015(b) provides relief from joint and several liability if the requesting spouse did not know and had no reason to know of the understatement.
2. I. R. C. § 6015(c) allows for allocation of liability as if separate returns were filed, subject to exceptions for actual knowledge and tax benefit received by the requesting spouse.
3. I. R. C. § 6015(c)(3)(C) states that if the requesting spouse had actual knowledge of any item giving rise to the deficiency, that item must be allocated to the requesting spouse.
4. I. R. C. § 6015(d)(3)(B) limits relief under § 6015(c) to the extent the requesting spouse received a tax benefit from the disallowed item.

Holding

1. The court held that Patricia Mora was not entitled to relief under I. R. C. § 6015(b) because she had reason to know of the understatement due to the size of the deductions relative to their income.
2. The court held that Patricia Mora was entitled to partial relief under I. R. C. § 6015(c) because the items giving rise to the deficiency were attributable to Lynn Raspberry's activities and partnership interest, and Mora did not have actual knowledge of these items.
3. The court held that Mora's relief under I. R. C. § 6015(c) was limited by the tax benefit she received from the disallowed deductions.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning included the following points:
– Under I. R. C. § 6015(b), Mora failed to show she had no reason to know of the understatement. The court applied the Ninth Circuit's standard from Price v. Commissioner, which states that a spouse has reason to know of a substantial understatement if a reasonably prudent taxpayer in her position would question the legitimacy of large deductions. The size of the deductions in relation to their income was significant enough to put a reasonably prudent taxpayer on notice, and Mora failed to make inquiries.
– Under I. R. C. § 6015(c), the court applied the standard from King v. Commissioner, which held that actual knowledge requires knowledge of the factual basis for the disallowance of the deduction. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument to distinguish limited partnership investments from other activities, stating that the statute makes no such distinction. Therefore, the court found that Mora did not have actual knowledge of the factual basis for the disallowance of the partnership losses.
– The court also addressed the tax benefit exception under I. R. C. § 6015(d)(3)(B).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Since Mora received a tax benefit from the disallowed deductions, her relief under § 6015(c) was limited to the proportion of the deficiency equal to the proportion of the total deduction that benefited her.

Disposition

The court denied relief under I. R. C. § 6015(b) but granted partial relief under I. R. C. § 6015(c), limited by the tax benefit Mora received. The case was to be resolved under Rule 155 to determine the exact amount of Mora's liability.

Significance/Impact

Mora v. Commissioner is significant for its clarification of the standards for relief under I. R. C. § 6015(b) and (c). The case established that the size of deductions relative to income can be a factor in determining whether a spouse had reason to know of an understatement under § 6015(b). It also reinforced the principle from King v. Commissioner that actual knowledge under § 6015(c) requires knowledge of the factual basis for the disallowance of the deduction, not just awareness of the activity. The case's treatment of the tax benefit exception under § 6015(d)(3)(B) provides guidance on how to allocate liability when a requesting spouse has benefited from a disallowed deduction. Subsequent cases have cited Mora for these principles, impacting the approach to relief from joint and several tax liability.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.