CC: MGRS

DEC 1.6 1988

Internal Revenue Service memorandum District Director

2

 $\{ (x_i) \in \{x_i\} \}$

 $::=\{i\}$

60

LGS DEC 16 FM 2: C4 5480

to: DEC 12 1988 IRS to: District Directors Western Regio ACRAMENTO DISIRICI (Simultaneous copies to Chiefs, Collection Division)

from: Assistant Regional Commissioner (Collection) C

SUbjec(:) Substitute for Return Pregram

The attached National Office memorandum on the above subject, dated

October 24, 1988, is forwarded for your information.

If there are any questions, please have a member of your staff contact

Rick Bazick on FTS 461-6806 or SAM 202-0027.

Attachment COLLECTION DIVISION ACTION CH!EF. FB I BINELIBILE PHILE-FB III CHIEF. T& MGMT, ANA CADRE MG

	RECEIVE	
	TO DIS. 1	DIR.
DATE: 2-16-88		
DIST.	RESP.	INFO.
DD		
ADD		
PE:O		
EEC		
9AQ		
DPCC		
RM		
C		$\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$
Ľ		
CI		
TJ		
QC		
Cvo Ecn	it:	

	rienal Revenue Service
	nemorandum
1.15° 7 14 179 1 14	OCT+2.4-1988
to:	Assistant Regional Commissioners (Examination and Collection) Assistant Commissioner (International) IN Director, Office of Management, Planning and Research IN:M (Information Copies to Service Center Directors)
rom:	Assistant Commissioner (Examination) EX futur films Assistant Commissioner (Collection) CO Mohn Tr Gebr
ject:	Substitute for Return Program
	This memorandum serves as a follow-up to our joint memorandum on the Substitute for Return Program (SFR) issued on March 1, 1988. In that memorandum, we stated our intention to clarify the issue of joint filing status on SFR cases by requesting an interpretation from Chief Counsel, while tempo- rary procedures were provided in the interim. This memorandum incorporates the opinion of Chief Counsel on the issue, as well as the recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in <u>Phillips</u> , #87-1398.
	Prior to the appellate decision in <u>Phillips</u> , the position of Chief Counsel has been that the statutory provisions of IRC 6013(b) do <u>not</u> prevent the allowance of joint filing status to qualifying taxpayers after the Notice of Deficiency has been issued (or separate return filed), as long as the following three conditions are all met:
	 the joint return is filed within 3 years of the original due date of the return (not including extended due dates), the taxpayers must not file a petition with the U.S. Tax Court for the year in question, and the taxpayers must pay the tax reflected on the joint return at or before the time'of filing the joint return.
	The Service chose not to pursue the IRC 6020(b) issue (regarding what constitutes a valid substitute for return) in the <u>Phillips</u> case, and only appealed the joint filing status issue of IRC 6013(b) to the circuit court. The only evidence of a substitute for return submitted to the Tax Court in <u>Phillips</u> was an incomplete Form 1040 with only entity informa- tion on it, the so called "dummy return." Since the Tax Court found that the "dummy return" submitted alone did not consti- tute a substitute for return, no prior separate return had been filed by the taxpayer, and nothing in the case prevented the
	application of joint rates. As a result, the Court of Appeals found for the taxpayer.

er on die eerste beken het en en en de geben beken beken die beste stelle een die de de de de stelle en en die het geben geben e A - P. Contractory of the second and the alternative of the second second second second second second second se (in yi -2-2 Z

44

۰.

. Assistant Regional Commissioners (Examination and Collection) and Assistant Commissioner (International) IN

Attn: Director, Office of Management, Planning and Research IN:M

We believe that a properly prepared SFR case file, including a Form 1040 with only entity information, a complete examination report, and a Notice of Deficiency, is supportable in court. Therefore, the issuance of a Notice of Deficiency on a thoroughly prepared SFR case file constitutes a separate fil-ing, and the limitations on joint filing as itemized in the second paragraph of this memorandum would be applicable. Other recent court decisions have supported this position (see Smalldridge, 86-2 USTC 9764, in which the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld a Tax Court decision for the Service; and Conovitz, 39 TCM 929). Therefore, we will follow the guidelines above in all our future preparations of SFR cases.

We acknowledge that in some circumstances it will be administratively difficult to resolve joint filing issues, especially when the return or request arrives toward the end of the 90-day period or when the return raises other issues not previously addressed in the Notice of Deficiency. Ideally, we would like to have enough time to be able to review all of the taxpayer's information, determine what additional information might be needed, and prepare a detailed response with enough remaining time for the taxpayer to petition the Tax Court. However, in many cases we do not have this luxury.

To the extent possible, we should expedite a response to to the extent possible, we should expedite a response to the taxpayer during the 90-day period, including all related joint filing status issues (spousal income, joint tax rates, exemptions) and other allowable items, and inform the taxpayer that the statutory period for filing a petition with the Tax Court has not been, and cannot be, extended by either party. Reasons for disallowance of unallowable or unsubstantiated items should be included in our response. If a phone number is available and there is little time left for the taxpayer to file a petition, we should call the taxpayer to inform him/her of our decision and follow it up with, a written response.

If the taxpayer agrees with our examination report and the only outstanding issue is full payment, Collection person-nel should contact the taxpayer immediately (by telephone, if possible) educing him/her of the contact of the second possible), advising him/her of the amount and deadline for submitting payment.

· ·

÷

•

. . -

シッシ Ľ W 12 W 12 W 0 Ĩ 33 IJ ο ょ 0,1,0 00% Le le l Ō, Ø

0

an in the state of the second second state state and the second state of the second state of the second state is second at the second state in the second state is second at the second state is a second state of the second state of the second state of the second state of the second state 1. -----Same and A Assistant Regional Commissioners (Examination and Collection) Assistant Commissioner (International) IN at the the same and the Attn: Director, Office of Management, Planning and Research IN:M L રો We will continue to allow unrestricted joint filing status prior to issuance of the Notice of Deficiency or the filing of り a separate return. All returns filed under the SFR Program, whether before or after issuance of the Notice, should be ર્ગ screened by Examination for audit potential before processing and assessment. The procedures provided in the previous \$ memorandum for handling returns filed during the 90-day period should still be followed. 101101 Returns filed during the 90-day period require a signed examination report or waiver of restrictions to be considered agreed and allow for assessment of tax and penalties. There-2 fore, supplemental reports should be used to secure agreements to reduced tax liabilities in Notice of Deficiency cases. 0 Where Collection personnel work taxpayer responses, they can ì use Examination's supplemental report procedures. 3 We would like to emphasize the importance of training in the examination of SFR cases because of the multitude of tax 5 issues that may arise during our contacts with taxpayers in this program. Since any number of unusual and complex issues ο . can be raised on returns filed under the SFR Program, we need to ensure that front-line personnel are provided with broad tax ĩ law awareness modules so as to be able to recognize potential examination issues and identify such other compliance problems as tax fraud. \mathcal{F} ୬ Discussions with the field and other functions have shown 1 Ś that there are inconsistencies in the handling of the statute of limitations in Substitute for Return cases. We would like 3 to call your attention to the fact that, under IRC 6501(b)(3), the preparation and filing of an SFR return by the Service does not begin the tolling of the statute of limitations. The normal "3 years from filing/2 years from payment" limitations on assessment do not begin until the taxpayer voluntarily files a return or signs an agreement to-a tax assessment proposed by , Lă l the Service. If you have any questions, please have a member of your کر staff contact Duke Lokka in Examination at FTS 566-6474 or Lois Earley in Collection at FTS 343-9673. 122 .о ଇ . . 3 è. . , **__**}```' . . . 1 ...