

authorized only if a credit or refund to the taxpayer or related taxpayer, attributable to such adjustment, was not barred by any law or rule of law when the taxpayer first maintained in writing before the Commissioner or the Tax Court that he was entitled to such deduction or credit for the taxable year to which the determination relates. The taxpayer will be considered to have first maintained in writing before the Commissioner or the Tax Court that he was entitled to such deduction or credit when he first formally asserts his right to such deduction or credit as, for example, in a return, in a claim for refund, or in a petition (or an amended petition) before the Tax Court.

(c) Under the circumstances of adjustment with respect to which the conditions stated in this section are applicable, the conditions stated in § 1.1311(b)-1 (maintenance of an inconsistent position) are not required. See paragraph (b) of § 1.1312-3 and § 1.1312-4 for examples of the application of this section.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12032, Nov. 26, 1960]

§ 1.1311(b)-3 Existence of relationship in case of adjustment by way of deficiency assessment.

(a) Except for cases described in paragraph (b) of § 1.1312-3, no adjustment by way of a deficiency assessment shall be made, with respect to a related taxpayer, unless the relationship existed both at some time during the taxable year with respect to which the error was made and at the time the taxpayer with respect to whom the determination is made first maintained the inconsistent position with respect to the taxable year to which the determination relates. In the case of an adjustment by way of a deficiency assessment under the circumstance described in paragraph (b) of § 1.1312-3 (where the maintenance of an inconsistent position is not required), the relationship need exist only at some time during the taxable year in which the error was made.

(b) If the inconsistent position is maintained in a return, claim for refund, or petition (or amended petition) to the Tax Court of the United States for the taxable year in respect to which the determination is made, the req-

uisite 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, 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

Internal Revenue Service, Treasury

§ 1.1312-3

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