

**BEFORE THE TAX COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

In the Matter of the Protest of )  
[Redacted], ) DOCKET NO. 25869  
 )  
 )  
Petitioners. ) DECISION  
 )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

The petitioners protest the Notice of Deficiency Determination issued by the auditor for the Idaho State Tax Commission (Commission) dated August 6, 2013. The Notice of Deficiency Determination (NODD) asserted additional liability for Idaho income tax, penalty, and interest in the total amount of \$1,880 for 2010.

Two issues are to be addressed in this decision:

1. Are the petitioners entitled to carry their entire 2009 Idaho net operating loss to their 2010 Idaho income tax return without such loss being reduced by the amounts that could have been carried back to 2007 and 2008, and
2. Are the petitioners entitled to a credit in the amount of \$100 for a noncash contribution to the [Redacted].

The first issue in this docket is whether the petitioners are entitled to deduct a net operating loss incurred in 2009 on their 2010 Idaho income tax return. The petitioners timely filed their 2009 Idaho income tax return electronically. The auditor reduced the 2009 net operating loss deduction claimed on the 2010 return by the amount that should have been absorbed by the petitioners carrying the loss back to 2007 and 2008, since the petitioners did not elect to forgo the carryback of the net operating loss. At the time that the NODD was issued to the petitioners, the statute of limitations had expired for the filing of a claim to carry the net operating loss back to 2007 or 2008.

The petitioners protested the NODD, making the following statement:

The facts and circumstances clearly indicate that it was our intention to carry forward our net operating loss on our 2009 tax return. We feel that reasonable professional judgment supports this stance along with the enactment of Bill 2013 ID H 184. The proposed changes are not equitable between the state and the taxpayer when applying the loss to a tax year where the statute of limitations to claim a refund has expired. The intent of tax law is to be equitable.

That the petitioners incurred the loss is not in question. The question to be addressed is whether the petitioners are entitled to carry the loss forward, rather than carrying the loss to an earlier year. Idaho Code Section 63-3022 stated [2009], in pertinent part:

(c) (1) A net operating loss for any taxable year commencing on and after January 1, 2000, shall be a net operating loss carryback not to exceed a total of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) to the two (2) immediately preceding taxable years. Any portion of the net operating loss not subtracted in the two (2) preceding years may be subtracted in the next twenty (20) years succeeding the taxable year in which the loss arises in order until exhausted. The sum of the deductions may not exceed the amount of the net operating loss deduction incurred. At the election of the taxpayer, the two (2) year carryback may be foregone and the loss subtracted from income received in taxable years arising in the next twenty (20) years succeeding the taxable year in which the loss arises in order until exhausted. The election shall be made as under section 172(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. An election under this subsection must be in the manner prescribed in the rules of the state tax commission and once made is irrevocable for the year in which it is made. (Underlining added.)

Rule 201 set forth the manner prescribed for the making of the election to forego the carryback of the net operating loss. It stated, in part:

05. Timing and Method of Electing to Forego Carryback. (3-30-01)

a. Net operating losses incurred in taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 2001. The election must be made by the due date of the loss year return, including extensions. Once the completed return is filed, the extension period expires. Unless otherwise provided in the Idaho return or in an Idaho form accompanying a return for the taxable year, the election referred to in this Subsection shall be made by attaching a statement to the taxpayer's income tax return for the taxable year of the loss. The statement must contain the following information: (3-30-01)

i. The name, address, and taxpayer's social security number or employer identification number; (3-20-97)

ii. A statement that the taxpayer makes the election pursuant to Section 63-3022(c)(1), Idaho Code, to forego the carryback provision; and (7-1-99)

iii. The amount of the net operating loss. (3-20-97)

b. Net operating losses incurred in taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2001. The election must be made by the due date of the Idaho loss year return, including extensions. Once the completed Idaho return is filed, the extension period expires. The election shall be made by either attaching a copy of the federal election to forego the federal net operating loss carryback to the Idaho income tax return for the taxable year of the loss or following the requirements of Subsection 201.05.a. (3-30-01)

c. If the election is made on an amended or original return filed subsequent to the time allowed in Subsections 201.05.a. and 201.05.b., it is considered untimely and the net operating loss shall be applied as provided in Subsection 201.04.b. (3-30-01)

The petitioners' 2009 Idaho income tax return was filed electronically on February 22, 2010. In that return, no indication was present indicating that the petitioners intended to forego the carryback of the net operating loss. The petitioners could have carried the loss in question to the two prior years. However, the petitioners did not file a claim for either of those years to claim this available loss. Upon receiving the notice from the auditor that the net operating loss was going to be disallowed on the 2010 return, the petitioners advised the auditor that it had been their intent to forego the carryback of the net operating loss.

The Commission finds the matter to be parallel to a [Redacted] matter addressed by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals which stated, in part, the following:

Taxpayers assert that even if their Form 4625 Line 11 entry did not literally comply with the requirements of Temporary Regulation 7.0(d), they have nevertheless substantially complied with the requirements of section 172(b)(3)(C) so that strict adherence to the regulation was unnecessary.

Although regulatory requirements that relate to the substance or essence of a statutory provision of the Internal Revenue Code must be strictly complied with, a line of cases from the United States Tax Court has established that "substantial

compliance with regulatory requirements may suffice when such requirements are procedural and when the essential statutory purposes have been fulfilled.” American Air Filter v. Commissioner, 81 T.C. 709, 719 (1983). In a number of cases the court has determined that a taxpayer has substantially complied with a statute of the tax code, even though he failed to follow the strict procedures for making an election as set forth in a regulation promulgated pursuant to the statute. See, e.g., American Air Filter, id.; Taylor v. Commissioner, 67 T.C. 1071 (1977); Columbia Iron & Metal Co. v. Commissioner, 61 T.C. 5 (1973). Where regulatory requirements relate to the substance or essence of statutes requiring elections, however, the court has rejected assertions of substantial compliance. See, e.g., Penn-Dixie Steel Corp. v. Commissioner, 69 T.C. 837 (1978); Dunavant v. Commissioner, 63 T.C. 316 (1974); Valdes v. Commissioner, 60 T.C. 910 (1973).

The primary inquiry, then, concerns the “essence” of section 172(b)(3)(C), and whether the election requirement relates to that essence or is merely procedural or directory. Taxpayers point us to the legislative history of the statute, which indicates that the statute was drafted out of congressional concern that because of adverse economic conditions in the years just prior to 1976, many taxpayers would not generate sufficient income in existing carryover periods to enable them to use their large operating loss carryovers: “[i]n order to reduce the possibility that this problem will arise in the future, the committee has decided to provide a loss carryover option under which eligible business taxpayers *may elect a longer loss carryover in lieu of the loss carryback to which they are otherwise entitled.*” S.Rep. No. 938, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. 198, *reprinted in* 1976 U.S.Code Cong. & Ad.News 2897, 3439, 3629 [our emphasis]. Taxpayers argue that it is clear from this statement of legislative intent and from the plain language of the statute itself that the only condition or requirement of the statute is that the taxpayer be entitled to a carryback period under section 172(b)(1). Taxpayers were entitled to a carryback period in 1976, and seem to conclude that they thereby substantially complied with the statute, arguing that the requirement of an election statement is merely procedural.

If by this taxpayers mean that no election of any kind is essential to the statute, the argument can be dismissed out of hand; the plain language of the statute requires not only that a taxpayer be entitled to a net operating loss carryback, but also that he make an “irrevocable” election “to relinquish the entire carryback period with respect to a net operating loss for [the] taxable year...” 26 U.S.C. § 172(b)(3)(C). Were taxpayers’ argument correct, every taxpayer with a net operating loss would automatically be held to have substantially complied with the statute without taking any steps to make an election or having desired to so elect at all.

Young v. Commissioner, 783 F.2d 1201, 1205 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986).

The Commission finds that the requirements for the making of the election clearly provide that since the return was filed by the original due date, the election to forego the carryback of the net operating loss must have been made by the original due date, April 15, 2010. The petitioners' argument is that since their paper copy of the return filed with the Commission shows that they elected to forego the carryback, that this should be considered to have been sufficient compliance with the election requirement. The Commission disagrees. Accordingly, only the reduced (by the amount that would have been absorbed in 2007 and 2008) amount of the 2009 net operating loss is an allowable deduction on the petitioners' 2010 Idaho income tax return. The petitioners contend that this treatment is not equitable. Statutes of limitation often (if not always) create equitable issues. Nonetheless, the statute of limitation in this matter is clear and unequivocal.

The second issue in this docket is to determine whether the petitioners are entitled to a credit for a noncash contribution to the [Redacted]. The petitioners did not claim this credit on their original 2010 Idaho income tax return, but raised the issue with the filing of their appeal of the Notice of Deficiency Determination. On October 7, 2013, the record indicates that the auditor called the petitioners and requested that documentation to support this contribution be sent. There is no indication in the file that this documentation was received by the Commission. The burden of proof with regard to the allowance of credits rests upon the taxpayers. Since this documentation was not provided, the Commission finds that the petitioners have also failed to carry their burden of proof that they are entitled to this credit. Welch v. Helvering, 290 U.S. 111 (1933).

THEREFORE, the Notice of Deficiency Determination dated August 6, 2013, is hereby APPROVED, AFFIRMED, and MADE FINAL.

IT IS ORDERED, and THIS DOES ORDER, that the petitioners pay the following tax, penalty, and interest:

YEAR	TAX	PENALTY	INTEREST	TOTAL
2010	\$1,647	\$82	\$151	\$1,880
		LESS AMOUNT PAID		<u>(1,780)</u>
		BALANCE		<u>\$ 100</u>

DEMAND for immediate payment of the foregoing amount is hereby made and given.

An explanation of the petitioners' right to appeal this decision is enclosed.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2014.

IDAHO STATE TAX COMMISSION

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMMISSIONER

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2014, a copy of the within and foregoing DECISION was served by sending the same by United States mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to:

[Redacted]

Receipt No.  
  
\_\_\_\_\_