

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 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, 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