Carpenter Family Investments, LLC v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 136 T. C. 373 (2011)

In Carpenter Family Investments, LLC v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that the three-year statute of limitations under I. R. C. § 6501(a) applied to the IRS's assessment of tax, rejecting the IRS's attempt to apply a six-year period based on temporary and final regulations. The court held that the Supreme Court's decision in Colony, Inc. v. Commissioner unambiguously foreclosed the IRS's interpretation of what constitutes an "omission from gross income," thereby invalidating the regulations and affirming the three-year limit. This decision underscores the judiciary's role in statutory interpretation and the limitations on agency authority to redefine statutory terms post hoc.

Parties

Carpenter Family Investments, LLC (Petitioner) and Carpenter Capital Management, LLC (Tax Matters Partner) v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent).

Facts

Carpenter Family Investments, LLC, a partnership, sold shares of American Tower Corp. in 2000, reporting a gain of $6,323,116. The partnership's tax return was filed on or before October 15, 2001. The IRS issued a Final Partnership Administrative Adjustment (FPAA) on October 2, 2008, alleging that the partnership engaged in a Son-of-BOSS tax shelter transaction, which artificially inflated the basis of the stock sold, thereby understating the partnership's taxable gain. The IRS contended that this constituted an omission from gross income, justifying a six-year statute of limitations under I. R. C. § 6501(e)(1)(A).

Procedural History

Petitioner moved for summary judgment, arguing that the FPAA was issued beyond the three-year statute of limitations under I. R. C. § 6501(a). The IRS opposed, citing temporary and final regulations that purported to extend the limitations period to six years for cases involving basis overstatements. The Tax Court reviewed these regulations and the applicability of the Supreme Court's decision in Colony, Inc. v. Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether the applicable statute of limitations for the IRS's assessment of tax against Carpenter Family Investments, LLC, is three years under I. R. C. § 6501(a) or six years under I. R. C. § 6501(e)(1)(A), given the IRS's interpretation of "omission from gross income" in the context of basis overstatements.

Rule(s) of Law

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

I. R. C. § 6501(a) sets a general three-year statute of limitations for tax assessments. I. R. C. § 6501(e)(1)(A) extends this period to six years in cases of an omission from gross income. The Supreme Court in Colony, Inc. v. Commissioner held that an overstatement of basis does not constitute an "omission from gross income" under the statute's predecessor.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the three-year statute of limitations under I. R. C. § 6501(a) applied, as the Supreme Court's decision in Colony, Inc. v. Commissioner unambiguously precluded the IRS's interpretation of "omission from gross income" to include basis overstatements, thereby invalidating the IRS's temporary and final regulations.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the Supreme Court's decision in Colony was a Chevron step one holding, indicating that the statutory language was unambiguous. The court rejected the IRS's attempt to distinguish Colony to the trade or business context, following the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit's decision in Bakersfield Energy Partners, LP v. Commissioner. The court also found that the IRS's final regulations did not clearly repudiate Colony, failing the Chenery test which requires agency action to be upheld only on the grounds articulated by the agency. The court emphasized that legislative history, as considered in Colony, was relevant to the unambiguous interpretation of the statute. The court concluded that the IRS's regulations could not override the Supreme Court's interpretation without a clear statement to that effect, which was lacking in the regulations' preamble.

Disposition

The Tax Court granted the petitioner's motion for summary judgment, holding that the FPAA was untimely under the three-year statute of limitations. The court invalidated the consents to extend the limitations period, as they were executed after the FPAA was issued.

Significance/Impact

This decision reaffirmed the judiciary's role in statutory interpretation and highlighted limitations on the IRS's regulatory authority to redefine statutory terms post hoc. It clarified that an overstatement of basis does not constitute an omission from gross income for extending the statute of limitations, following the Supreme Court's ruling in Colony. The case also demonstrated the application of the Chevron framework in tax law, emphasizing the importance of unambiguous statutory language and the constraints on agency interpretations that contradict judicial precedents. The ruling impacted subsequent cases involving the IRS's attempts to apply extended limitations periods based on similar regulations and has implications

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

for the validity of agency regulations that seek to reinterpret longstanding judicial interpretations of statutes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.