Paschall v. Commissioner, 137 T. C. 8 (2011)

In Paschall v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court upheld the IRS's assessment of excise tax deficiencies and penalties on Robert Paschall for excess contributions to his Roth IRA from 2002 to 2006. The court ruled that the statute of limitations did not bar the IRS from assessing these deficiencies due to Paschall's failure to file required tax forms. This decision clarifies the IRS's authority to assess excise taxes on excess IRA contributions and the necessity of filing specific tax forms to trigger the statute of limitations.

Parties

Robert K. Paschall and Joan L. Paschall (Petitioners) v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent). The Paschalls were the taxpayers involved in this case, with Robert Paschall as the primary party regarding the Roth IRA contributions. The case was appealed to the United States Tax Court.

Facts

Robert Paschall, a retired engineer, engaged in a Roth IRA restructuring scheme orchestrated by A. Blair Stover, Jr. , of Grant Thornton, L. L. P. The scheme involved transferring approximately $1. 3 million from Paschall's traditional IRA to his Roth IRA through a series of corporate entities and transactions designed to avoid tax on the conversion. Paschall paid a $120,000 fee for the restructuring, which was facilitated by Grant Thornton and later Kruse Mennillo, L. L. P. The IRS determined that Paschall made excess contributions to his Roth IRA, leading to excise tax deficiencies and penalties for the tax years 2002 through 2006. Paschall did not file Form 5329 for any of these years, which is required to report and disclose the excise tax on excess contributions to Roth IRAs.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency to Paschall on February 1, 2008, for the 2004 and 2005 tax years, and on July 23, 2008, for the 2002, 2003, and 2006 tax years, asserting excise tax deficiencies under 26 U. S. C. § 4973 and additions to tax under 26 U. S. C. § 6651(a)(1) for failure to file Form 5329. Paschall timely filed petitions with the United States Tax Court challenging these determinations. The cases were consolidated for trial, briefing, and opinion. The Tax Court considered the statute of limitations issue and the merits of the IRS's determinations.

Issue(s)

Whether the statute of limitations barred the IRS from assessing and collecting excise tax deficiencies for the 2002, 2003, and 2004 tax years due to Paschall's failure to file Form 5329?

Whether Paschall made excess contributions to his Roth IRA, thereby incurring

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

excise tax deficiencies under 26 U. S. C. § 4973 for the tax years 2002 through 2006?

Whether Paschall was liable for additions to tax under 26 U. S. C. § 6651(a)(1) for failure to file Form 5329 for the tax years 2002 through 2006?

Rule(s) of Law

Under 26 U. S. C. § 6501(a), the IRS must assess tax within three years after the return was filed. However, under 26 U. S. C. § 6501(c)(3), if a return is not filed, the tax may be assessed at any time. The Supreme Court in Commissioner v. Lane-Wells Co. , 321 U. S. 219 (1944), established that the statute of limitations begins to run when a return is filed that provides sufficient information to allow the IRS to compute the taxpayer's liability. 26 U. S. C. § 4973 imposes a 6% excise tax on excess contributions to Roth IRAs, calculated on the lesser of the excess contribution or the fair market value of the account at the end of the taxable year. 26 U. S. C. § 6651(a)(1) imposes an addition to tax for failure to file a required return, unless such failure is due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the statute of limitations did not bar the IRS from assessing excise tax deficiencies for the 2002, 2003, and 2004 tax years because Paschall did not file the required Form 5329, and thus, the IRS could assess the tax at any time. The court also held that Paschall made excess contributions to his Roth IRA, making him liable for excise tax deficiencies under 26 U. S. C. § 4973 for the tax years 2002 through 2006. Furthermore, Paschall was liable for additions to tax under 26 U. S. C. § 6651(a)(1) for failure to file Form 5329, as he did not establish reasonable cause for his failure to file.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that Paschall's failure to file Form 5329 meant that the IRS could not reasonably discern his potential liability for the excise tax, thus the statute of limitations did not begin to run. The court rejected Paschall's argument that his Forms 1040 were sufficient to start the statute of limitations, citing case law that a return must provide sufficient information for the IRS to compute the tax liability. Regarding the excess contributions, the court found that the substance of the transactions, which involved transferring funds from a traditional IRA to a Roth IRA without paying taxes, resulted in excess contributions subject to the excise tax. The court determined that the excise tax should be calculated based on the fair market value of the Roth IRA at the end of each tax year. For the additions to tax, the court found that Paschall's reliance on advice from conflicted parties (Grant Thornton and Kruse Mennillo) did not constitute reasonable cause, and thus, he was liable for the additions to tax.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Disposition

The Tax Court sustained the IRS's determinations of excise tax deficiencies and additions to tax for the tax years 2002 through 2006. Decisions were entered under Tax Court Rule 155.

Significance/Impact

Paschall v. Commissioner is significant for clarifying the IRS's authority to assess excise taxes on excess contributions to Roth IRAs and the importance of filing specific tax forms to trigger the statute of limitations. The decision reinforces the principle that the substance of transactions, rather than their form, determines tax liability, and it underscores the necessity of filing required tax forms to avoid open-ended assessment periods. The case also highlights the limitations of relying on advice from conflicted parties in establishing reasonable cause for failing to file required tax returns.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.