

Zarky v. Commissioner, 123 T. C. 132 (U. S. Tax Ct. 2004)

In *Zarky v. Commissioner*, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that a taxpayer who failed to file a return but received a notice of deficiency could claim an overpayment refund if the payment was made within three years of the notice. This decision, stemming from the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, extended the refund limitation period for non-filers, allowing Michael Zarky to recover a \$270 overpayment withheld from his interest income, despite not filing a return for 1999.

Parties

Michael Zarky, the Petitioner, brought this case against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Respondent, in the United States Tax Court.

Facts

Michael Zarky did not file a Federal income tax return for the 1999 taxable year. During 1999, Zarky earned \$874 in interest income from savings accounts, from which \$270 was withheld as Federal income tax. Additionally, Zarky received \$212,029 from brokerage sales, which the Commissioner initially included in Zarky's gross income but later conceded was not taxable. On February 27, 2003, the Commissioner mailed Zarky a notice of deficiency asserting a tax liability of \$63,066 and various additions to tax. Following the Commissioner's concession that Zarky had no tax liability and had overpaid by \$270, the dispute centered on whether Zarky was entitled to a refund of this overpayment.

Procedural History

Zarky petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to redetermine the Commissioner's deficiency determination for the 1999 taxable year. The Commissioner conceded that Zarky had overpaid his 1999 Federal income tax by \$270. The issue before the Tax Court was whether Zarky was entitled to a refund of this overpayment under the applicable statutory provisions.

Issue(s)

Whether a taxpayer who did not file a Federal income tax return but received a notice of deficiency during the third year after the due date of the return is entitled to a refund of an overpayment made within three years of the notice of deficiency, pursuant to the flush language of section 6512(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997.

Rule(s) of Law

Section 6512(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code empowers the Tax Court to determine the existence and amount of any overpayment of tax to be refunded. Section 6512(b)(3)(B) limits the refund to amounts paid within the period applicable

under section 6511(b)(2), which, for taxable years ending after August 5, 1997, was extended to three years under certain conditions by the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. Section 6513(b)(1) treats amounts withheld as paid on April 15th of the following year.

Holding

The Tax Court held that Zarky was entitled to the \$270 overpayment because the notice of deficiency was mailed within the third year after the due date of his 1999 return, and the overpayment was considered paid within three years of the notice of deficiency.

Reasoning

The court's decision hinged on the interpretation of the flush language added to section 6512(b) by the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, which extended the refund limitation period from two to three years for non-filers receiving a notice of deficiency during the third year after the return's due date. The court noted that the \$270 withheld from Zarky's interest income was considered paid to the Commissioner on April 15, 2000, under section 6513(b)(1). Since the notice of deficiency was mailed on February 27, 2003, within the third year after the due date of the 1999 return, and the payment was within three years of this notice, Zarky met the conditions for a refund. The court applied the statutory interpretation method by considering the plain language of the statute and its legislative history, which confirmed the intent to extend the refund period for non-filers under these circumstances. The court also considered policy implications, noting that the extended period provided relief to taxpayers who might otherwise be barred from refunds due to non-filing.

Disposition

The court entered a decision stating that there was no deficiency or addition to tax due from Zarky and that he was entitled to a \$270 overpayment for 1999.

Significance/Impact

Zarky v. Commissioner is significant for its application of the extended refund limitation period under the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, providing a clearer interpretation of section 6512(b) for non-filers. This decision impacts the rights of taxpayers who fail to file returns but receive notices of deficiency, allowing them to claim refunds of overpayments made within the three-year window. Subsequent courts have cited this case as precedent for interpreting the statutory provisions related to overpayment refunds, reinforcing the principle that legislative intent to provide relief to non-filers should be respected. Practically, this ruling encourages the IRS to consider the timing of notices of deficiency and the potential for refunds when dealing with non-filers, and it informs tax practitioners about the availability of

refunds in similar situations.