Galloway v. Commissioner, 149 T. C. 19 (2017)

In *Galloway v. Commissioner*, the U. S. Tax Court clarified the calculation of tax deficiencies when the IRS issues a rebate exceeding the tax shown on a taxpayer's return. The court upheld a $7,500 deficiency and a $1,500 accuracy-related penalty against the Galloways for incorrectly claiming a $7,500 American Opportunity Credit (AOC) on their 2011 tax return. The ruling establishes that rebates in excess of the reported tax increase the deficiency, impacting how such discrepancies are addressed in tax litigation and reinforcing the importance of accurate tax reporting to avoid penalties.

Parties

James M. Galloway and Sarah M. Galloway, as Petitioners, filed a case against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as Respondent, in the United States Tax Court. They were designated as petitioners throughout the litigation process.

Facts

On their 2011 Federal income tax return, James and Sarah Galloway claimed a $7,500 American Opportunity Credit (AOC) for postsecondary education expenses of their children. This included a nonrefundable portion of $4,500, which they reported on Form 8863 but failed to carry over to their Form 1040. As a result, they only claimed the $3,000 refundable portion on their Form 1040, which reduced their tax liability from $6,984 to $3,984. The IRS processed their return, accounting for the $4,500 nonrefundable portion and refunded them $8,803 instead of the $4,303 they requested. Upon examination, the IRS disallowed the entire $7,500 AOC, and the Galloways conceded they were not entitled to the credit.

Procedural History

The Galloways filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's determination of a $7,500 deficiency and a $1,500 accuracy-related penalty. The IRS had processed the Galloways' return, adjusting their tax liability and issuing a rebate of $4,500 more than requested. Upon disallowing the claimed credit, the IRS determined the deficiency and penalty. The Tax Court reviewed the case under the de novo standard, which allows the court to independently determine the facts and law.

Issue(s)

Whether the excess of a rebate over the tax shown on a taxpayer's return increases the taxpayer's deficiency under I. R. C. sec. 6211(a)?

Whether the Galloways are liable for the accuracy-related penalty under I. R. C. sec. 6662(a) and (b)(2)?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

Under I. R. C. sec. 6211(a), a "deficiency" is defined as "the amount by which the tax imposed by subtitle A * * * exceeds the excess of — (1) the sum of (A) the amount shown as the tax by the taxpayer upon his return * * * plus (B) the amounts previously assessed (or collected without assessment) as a deficiency, over — (2) the amount of rebates, as defined by subsection (b)(2), made. " I. R. C. sec. 6211(b)(2) defines "rebate" as "so much of an abatement, credit, refund, or other repayment, as was made on the ground that the tax imposed by subtitle A * * * was less than the excess of the amount specified in subsection (a)(1) over the rebates previously made. "

Under I. R. C. sec. 6662(a) and (b)(2), an accuracy-related penalty of 20% is imposed on the portion of an underpayment attributable to a substantial understatement of income tax, defined as an understatement exceeding the greater of 10% of the tax required to be shown on the return or $5,000.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the excess of a rebate over the tax shown on a taxpayer's return increases the taxpayer's deficiency under I. R. C. sec. 6211(a). The Galloways' deficiency for 2011 was determined to be $7,500, calculated as the tax imposed of $6,984 minus the excess of the tax shown on their return of $3,984 over the $4,500 rebate. The court also held that the Galloways were liable for the $1,500 accuracy-related penalty under I. R. C. sec. 6662(a) and (b)(2), as their understatement of income tax was substantial and they failed to establish reasonable cause for the underpayment.

Reasoning

The Tax Court's reasoning focused on the statutory language of I. R. C. sec. 6211(a) and the purpose of allowing taxpayers to contest disallowance of refundable credits in deficiency proceedings. The court noted that previous cases implicitly accepted the concept that the excess of the tax shown on a return over rebates could be a negative number, which would increase a deficiency when rebates exceeded the tax shown. The court rejected the Galloways' argument that this principle should only apply when no rebates exist, finding no textual or logical basis for such a distinction. The court also addressed the Galloways' concern about potential manipulation by the IRS, clarifying that a payment can only qualify as a rebate if made on the ground that the tax imposed was less than the tax shown on the return.

Regarding the accuracy-related penalty, the court found that the Galloways' understatement of $7,500 exceeded the $5,000 threshold for a substantial understatement. The court rejected their arguments for reducing the understatement based on substantial authority or adequate disclosure, as they failed to meet the relevant standards. The court also found that the Galloways did not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

establish reasonable cause for their underpayment, as they could not demonstrate an honest and reasonable misunderstanding of the law, particularly given the clear instructions on Form 8863 regarding the AOC's four-year limit per student.

Disposition

The Tax Court entered a decision for the respondent, affirming the $7,500 deficiency and the $1,500 accuracy-related penalty.

Significance/Impact

The *Galloway* decision clarifies the calculation of deficiencies when the IRS issues rebates exceeding the tax shown on a return, affecting how taxpayers and the IRS handle such discrepancies in future deficiency proceedings. The ruling reinforces the importance of accurate tax reporting, especially regarding refundable credits, and the potential consequences of substantial understatements. The decision also underscores the limited scope of the reasonable cause exception to accuracy-related penalties, emphasizing the need for taxpayers to thoroughly understand and comply with tax laws and instructions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.