Couturier v. Commissioner, 162 T. C. No. 4 (United States Tax Court 2024)

In Couturier v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that a 2022 amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, which set a six-year statute of limitations for assessing certain excise taxes, does not apply retroactively. This decision impacts taxpayers who failed to file Form 5329 for years before the amendment, as the IRS retains the ability to assess taxes indefinitely for those periods. The ruling clarifies the temporal scope of statutory changes affecting tax assessments, emphasizing the importance of explicit congressional intent for retroactive application.

Parties

Plaintiff: Clair R. Couturier, Jr. (Petitioner). Defendant: Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent).

Facts

Clair R. Couturier, Jr. (Petitioner) was employed as a corporate executive until at least 2004 and participated in multiple deferred compensation arrangements, including an employee stock ownership plan (ESOP). In 2004, as part of a corporate reorganization, Petitioner received a $26 million buyout, which he allocated to his individual retirement account (IRA). The IRS determined that $25,132,892 of this amount constituted an excess contribution under I. R. C. § 4973, resulting in an excise tax liability for tax years 2004 through 2008. Petitioner filed timely Forms 1040 for these years but did not file Form 5329, Additional Taxes on Qualified Plans (Including IRAs) and Other Tax-Favored Accounts. On June 10, 2016, the IRS issued a notice of deficiency determining excise tax deficiencies for these years.

Procedural History

Petitioner timely filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court to challenge the notice of deficiency. In 2017, Petitioner moved for summary judgment, arguing that the notice was untimely under the three-year statute of limitations in I. R. C. § 6501(a). The IRS countered that the assessment could be made at any time under I. R. C. § 6501(c)(3) due to the absence of Form 5329. The Tax Court denied both parties' motions, finding the issue intertwined with the merits of whether excess contributions were made. In 2021, Petitioner filed a second motion for summary judgment, which was also denied. In 2023, Petitioner filed a Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, contending that the 2022 amendment to I. R. C. § 6501(l)(4) should apply retroactively, rendering the notice of deficiency untimely.

Issue(s)

Whether the amendment to I. R. C. § 6501(l)(4), effective December 29, 2022, applies retroactively to limit the IRS's ability to assess excise taxes under I. R. C. § 4973 for tax years 2004 through 2008, where the taxpayer filed Form 1040 but not Form 5329?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

I. R. C. § 4973 imposes an excise tax on excess contributions to an IRA. I. R. C. § 6501(a) generally requires tax assessments within three years after the return is filed, with exceptions under I. R. C. § 6501(c)(3) for failure to file a required return. The 2022 amendment to I. R. C. § 6501(l)(4) specifies that for excise taxes under I. R. C. § 4973, the statute of limitations begins with the filing of the income tax return, with a six-year limitation period applicable when no Form 5329 is filed. The amendment's effective date is specified as the date of enactment, December 29, 2022.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the amendment to I. R. C. § 6501(l)(4) applies prospectively only, to returns filed on or after December 29, 2022. Therefore, it does not apply to Petitioner's returns for tax years 2004 through 2008, and the notice of deficiency issued on June 10, 2016, was timely under the law in effect at that time.

Reasoning

The Court's analysis focused on the effective date of the amendment, which was specified to take effect on the date of enactment, December 29, 2022. The Court interpreted this to mean that the new rule applies to returns filed on or after that date, not to returns filed before. The Court noted that Congress has explicitly provided for retroactive application in other amendments to I. R. C. § 6501, but did not do so here. The Court also considered the presumption against retroactivity, finding no clear congressional intent to apply the amendment retroactively. The Court rejected Petitioner's argument that the amendment should apply to all pending disputes with the IRS as of the date of enactment, emphasizing that the statutory text does not support such an interpretation. The Court further explained that applying the amendment retroactively would impair the IRS's substantive right to assess taxes, which was not clearly intended by Congress.

Disposition

The Tax Court denied Petitioner's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, affirming that the notice of deficiency for tax years 2004 through 2008 was timely issued under the law as it existed before the 2022 amendment.

Significance/Impact

This decision clarifies the temporal application of statutory amendments affecting tax assessments, reinforcing the principle that clear congressional intent is required for retroactive application. It impacts taxpayers who did not file Form 5329 for years before the amendment, as the IRS retains the ability to assess excise taxes indefinitely for those periods. The ruling may influence future legislative drafting regarding the effective dates of tax law changes and underscores the importance of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

explicit language for retroactive effect. The decision also highlights the interplay between statutory provisions governing tax assessments and the need for precise interpretation of effective date provisions in tax legislation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.