

§ 1.1312-1

to the Tax Court of the United States for the taxable year in respect to which the determination is made, the requisite relationship must exist on the date of filing such document. If the inconsistent position is maintained in more than one of such documents, the requisite date is the date of filing of the document in which it was first maintained. If the inconsistent position was not thus maintained, then the relationship must exist on the date of the determination as, for example, where at the instance of the taxpayer a deduction is allowed, the right to which was not asserted in a return, claim for refund, or petition to the Tax Court, and a determination is effected by means of a closing agreement or an agreement under section 1313(a)(4).

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12033, Nov. 26, 1960]

§ 1.1312-1 Double inclusion of an item of gross income.

(a) Paragraph (1) of section 1312 applies if the determination requires the inclusion in a taxpayer's gross income of an item which was erroneously included in the gross income of the same taxpayer for another taxable year or of a related taxpayer for the same or another taxable year.

(b) The application of paragraph (a) of this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1. A taxpayer who keeps his books on the cash method erroneously included in income on his return for 1947 an item of accrued rent. In 1952, after the period of limitation on refunds for 1947 had expired, the Commissioner discovered that the taxpayer received this rent in 1948 and asserted a deficiency for the year 1948 which is sustained by the Tax Court of the United States in 1955. An adjustment in favor of the taxpayer is authorized with respect to the year 1947. If the taxpayer had returned the rent for both 1947 and 1948 and by a determination was denied a refund claim for 1948 on account of the rent item, a similar adjustment is authorized.

Example 2. A husband assigned to his wife salary to be earned by him in the year 1952. The wife included such salary in her separate return for that year and the husband omitted it. The Commissioner asserted a deficiency against the wife for 1952 with respect to a different item; she contested that deficiency, and the Tax Court entered an order in her case which became final in 1955. The wife would therefore be barred by section 6512(a) from claiming a refund for 1952. Thereafter,

26 CFR Ch. I (4-1-09 Edition)

the Commissioner asserted a deficiency against the husband on account of the omission of such salary from his return for 1952. In 1955 the husband and the Commissioner enter into a closing agreement for the year 1952 in which the salary is taxed to the husband. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the wife's tax for 1952.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12033, Nov. 26, 1960]

§ 1.1312-2 Double allowance of a deduction or credit.

(a) Paragraph (2) of section 1312 applies if the determination allows the taxpayer a deduction or credit which was erroneously allowed the same taxpayer for another taxable year or a related taxpayer for the same or another taxable year.

(b) The application of paragraph (a) of this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1. A taxpayer in his return for 1950 claimed and was allowed a deduction for destruction of timber by a forest fire. Subsequently, it was discovered that the forest fire occurred in 1951 rather than 1950. After the expiration of the period of limitations for the assessment of a deficiency for 1950, the taxpayer filed a claim for refund for 1951 based upon a deduction for the fire loss in that year. The Commissioner in 1955 allows the claim for refund. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the year 1950.

Example 2. The beneficiary of a testamentary trust in his return for 1949 claimed, and was allowed, a deduction for depreciation of the trust property. The Commissioner asserted a deficiency against the beneficiary for 1949 with respect to a different item and a final decision of the Tax Court of the United States was rendered in 1951, so that the Commissioner was thereafter barred by section 272(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 from asserting a further deficiency against the beneficiary for 1949. The trustee thereafter filed a timely refund claim contending that, under the terms of the will, the trust, and not the beneficiary, was entitled to the allowance for depreciation. The court in 1955 sustains the refund claim. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the beneficiary's tax for 1949.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12033, Nov. 26, 1960]

§ 1.1312-3 Double exclusion of an item of gross income.

(a) *Items included in income or with respect to which a tax was paid.* (1) Paragraph (3)(A) of section 1312 applies if the determination requires the exclusion, from a taxpayer's gross income,

of an item included in a return filed by the taxpayer, or with respect to which tax was paid, and which was erroneously excluded or omitted from the gross income of the same taxpayer for another taxable year or of a related taxpayer for the same or another taxable year.

(2) The application of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1. (i) A taxpayer received payments in 1951 under a contract for the performance of services and included the payments in his return for that year. After the expiration of the period of limitations for the assessment of a deficiency for 1950, the Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency to the taxpayer for the year 1951 based upon adjustments to other items, and the taxpayer filed a petition with the Tax Court of the United States and maintained in the proceedings before the Tax Court that he kept his books on the accrual basis and that the payments received in 1951 were on income that had accrued and was properly taxable in 1950. A final decision of the Tax Court was rendered in 1955 excluding the payments from 1951 income. An adjustment in favor of the Commissioner is authorized with respect to the year 1950, whether or not a tax had been paid on the income reported in the 1951 return.

(ii) Assume the same facts as in (i), except that the taxpayer had not included the payments in any return and had not paid a tax thereon. No adjustment would be authorized under section 1312(3)(A) with respect to the year 1950. If the taxpayer, however, had paid a deficiency asserted for 1951 based upon the inclusion of the payments in 1951 income and thereafter successfully sued for refund thereof, an adjustment would be authorized with respect to the year 1950. (See paragraph (b) of this section for circumstances under which correction is authorized with respect to items not included in income and on which a tax was not paid.)

Example 2. A father and son conducted a partnership business, each being entitled to one-half of the net profits. The father included the entire net income of the partnership in his return for 1948, and the son included no portion of this income in his return for that year. Shortly before the expiration of the period of limitations with respect to deficiency assessments and refund claims for both father and son for 1948, the father filed a claim for refund of that portion of his 1948 tax attributable to the half of the partnership income which should have been included in the son's return. The court sustains the claim for refund in 1955. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the son's tax for 1948.

(b) *Items not included in income and with respect to which the tax was not paid.* (1) Paragraph (3)(B) of section 1312 applies if the determination requires the exclusion from gross income of an item not included in a return filed by the taxpayer and with respect to which a tax was not paid, but which is includible in the gross income of the same taxpayer for another taxable year, or in the gross income of a related taxpayer for the same or another taxable year. This is one of the two circumstances in which the maintenance of an inconsistent position is not a requirement for an adjustment, but the requirements in paragraph (a) of § 1.1311(b)-2 must be fulfilled (correction not barred at time of erroneous action).

(2) The application of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1. The taxpayer, A, who computes his income by use of the accrual method of accounting, performed in 1949 services for which he received payments in 1949 and 1950. He did not include in his return for either 1949 or 1950 the payments which he received in 1950, and he paid no tax with respect to such payments. In 1952 the Commissioner sent a notice of deficiency to A with respect to the year 1949, contending that A should have included all of such payments in his return for that year. A contested the deficiency on the basis that in 1949 he had no accruable right to the payments which he received in 1950. In 1955 (after the expiration of the period of limitations for assessing deficiencies with respect to 1950), the Tax Court sustains A's position. The Commissioner may assess a deficiency for 1950, since a deficiency assessment for that year was not barred when he sent the notice of deficiency with respect to 1949.

Example 2. B and C were partners in 1950, each being entitled to one-half of the profits of the partnership business. During 1950, B received an item of income which he treated as partnership income so that his return for that year reflected only 50 percent of such item. C, however, included no part of such item in any return and paid no tax with respect thereto. In 1952, the Commissioner sent to C a notice of deficiency with respect to 1950, contending that his return for that year should have reflected 50 percent of such item. C contested the deficiency on the basis that such item was not partnership income. In 1955, after the expiration of the period of limitations for assessing deficiencies with respect to 1950, the Tax Court sustained C's

§ 1.1312-4

position. The Commissioner may assess a deficiency against B with respect to 1950 requiring him to include the entire amount of such item in his income since assessment of the deficiency was not barred when the Commissioner sent the notice of deficiency with respect to such item to C.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12034, Nov. 26, 1960]

§ 1.1312-4 Double disallowance of a deduction or credit.

(a) Paragraph (4) of section 1312 applies if the determination disallows a deduction or credit which should have been, but was not, allowed to the same taxpayer for another taxable year or to a related taxpayer for the same or another taxable year. This is one of the two circumstances in which the maintenance of an inconsistent position is not a requirement for an adjustment but the requirements in paragraph (b) of § 1.1311(b)-2 must be fulfilled (correction not barred at time of erroneous action).

(b) The application of paragraph (a) of this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1. The taxpayer, A, who computes his income by use of the accrual method of accounting, deducted in his return for the taxable year 1951 an item of expense which he paid in such year. At the time A filed his return for 1951, the statute of limitations for 1950 had not expired. Subsequently, the Commissioner asserted a deficiency for 1951 based on the position that the liability for such expense should have been accrued for the taxable year 1950. In 1955, after the period of limitations on refunds for 1950 had expired, there was a determination by the Tax Court disallowing such deduction for the taxable year 1951. A is entitled to an adjustment for the taxable year 1950. However, if such liability should have been accrued for the taxable year 1946 instead of 1950, A would not be entitled to an adjustment, if a credit or refund with respect to 1946 was already barred when he deducted such expense for the taxable year 1951.

Example 2. The taxpayer, B, in his return for 1951 claimed a deduction for a charitable contribution. The Commissioner asserted a deficiency for such year contending that 50 percent of the deduction should be disallowed, since the contribution was made from community property 50 percent of which was attributable to B's spouse. The deficiency is sustained by the Tax Court in 1956, subsequent to the period of limitations within which B's spouse could claim a refund with respect to 1951. An adjustment is permitted to B's spouse, a related taxpayer,

26 CFR Ch. I (4-1-09 Edition)

since a refund attributable to a deduction by her of such contribution was not barred when B claimed the deduction.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12034, Nov. 26, 1960]

§ 1.1312-5 Correlative deductions and inclusions for trusts or estates and legatees, beneficiaries, or heirs.

(a) Paragraph (5) of section 1312 applies to distributions by a trust or an estate to the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees. If the determination relates to the amount of the deduction allowed by sections 651 and 661 or the inclusion in taxable income of the beneficiary required by sections 652 and 662 (including amounts falling within subpart D, subchapter J, chapter 1 of the Code, relating to treatment of excess distributions by trusts), or if the determination relates to the additional deduction (or inclusion) specified in section 162 (b) and (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (or the corresponding provisions of a prior revenue act), with respect to amounts paid, credited, or required to be distributed to the beneficiaries, heirs, and legatees, and such determination requires:

(1) The allowance to the estate or trust of the deduction when such amounts have been erroneously omitted or excluded from the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees; or

(2) The inclusion of such amounts in the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees when the deduction has been erroneously disallowed to or omitted by the estate or trust; or

(3) The disallowance to an estate or trust of the deduction when such amounts have been erroneously included in the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees; or

(4) The exclusion of such amounts from the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees when the deduction has been erroneously allowed to the estate or trust.

(b) The application of paragraph (a)(1) of this section may be illustrated by the following example:

Example: For the taxable year 1954, a trustee, directed by the trust instrument to accumulate the trust income, made no distribution to the beneficiary and returned the entire income as taxable to the trust. Accordingly the beneficiary did not include the trust income in his return for the year 1954. In 1957, a State court holds invalid the clause