

The Constitution's Dormant Commerce Clause Limits The Power of States to Tax Their Residents — *Comptroller of the Treasury Of Maryland v. Brian Wynne et ux.*

By Donald Williamson
Kogod Eminent Professor of Taxation
Howard S. Dvorkin Faculty Fellow
Kogod School of Business
American University
Washington, D.C., and
Michelle M. Hobbs
Senior Manager
Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, LLP
McLean, Virginia*

The Constitution's dormant Commerce Clause limits the power of states to tax their residents. In *Comptroller of the Treasury of Maryland v. Brian Wynne et ux.*, the Supreme Court held that Maryland's tax on income earned by its residents in other states violated the dormant Commerce Clause. The Court's decision is a significant victory for taxpayers and a landmark ruling in the history of the dormant Commerce Clause. The Court held that Maryland's tax on income earned by its residents in other states violated the dormant Commerce Clause because it discriminated against interstate commerce. The Court's decision is a significant victory for taxpayers and a landmark ruling in the history of the dormant Commerce Clause.

MARYLAND STATUTE

Section 10-103 of the Maryland Tax and Business Code, which provides for the taxation of income earned by Maryland residents in other states, is unconstitutional under the dormant Commerce Clause.

On March 18, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States, in a 5-4 decision, held that Maryland's tax on income earned by its residents in other states violated the dormant Commerce Clause. The Court's decision is a significant victory for taxpayers and a landmark ruling in the history of the dormant Commerce Clause. The Court held that Maryland's tax on income earned by its residents in other states violated the dormant Commerce Clause because it discriminated against interstate commerce. The Court's decision is a significant victory for taxpayers and a landmark ruling in the history of the dormant Commerce Clause.

Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Jefferson Lines, Inc.,⁴¹

Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit:
In a case involving the application of the
statute of limitations, the Tax Commission
brought suit against Jefferson Lines, Inc.
for the refund of taxes. The Tax Commission
alleged that Jefferson Lines, Inc. had
paid taxes on the basis of a determination
of the Tax Commission, but that the
determination was based on an incorrect
interpretation of the statute. The Tax
Commission sought a refund of the taxes
paid. The Tax Commission also sought
an award of interest on the taxes paid.
The Tax Commission argued that the
statute of limitations should not apply
because the Tax Commission's determination
was based on an incorrect interpretation
of the statute. The Tax Commission
argued that the statute of limitations
should not apply because the Tax
Commission's determination was based
on an incorrect interpretation of the
statute.⁴²

Notwithstanding the fact that the
Supreme Court has held that the
Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth
Circuit has jurisdiction to review the
Tax Commission's determination, the
Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth
Circuit has held that the Tax
Commission's determination is final.⁴³ The
Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth
Circuit has held that the Tax
Commission's determination is final.⁴⁴ The
Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth
Circuit has held that the Tax
Commission's determination is final.
*Moorman Manufacturing Co. v. Bair*⁴⁵ The
Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth
Circuit has held that the Tax
Commission's determination is final.

The Tax Commission argued that the
statute of limitations should not apply
because the Tax Commission's determination
was based on an incorrect interpretation
of the statute. The Tax Commission
argued that the statute of limitations
should not apply because the Tax
Commission's determination was based
on an incorrect interpretation of the
statute.⁴²

at I a a .1(t)-316.1(a) t 316.1(b)-3:T*[(b .9(Ba))-3.1(, .1.1(t)-316.1(I a)87.6L)-1b 1

67 *Id.* at 1811.

THOMAS DISSENT

68 Thomas dissenting at 1813: “W... 1787... Ma... N J... C... *Id.* 1807.”

69 *Id.* at 1813.

70 S... *Letters Clear Way for Maryland Tax Refund Under High Court ‘Wynne’ Ruling*, 109 Da. Ta. R., H-2 (J. 8, 2015).

71 S... *‘Wynne’ Ruling Prompts Maryland County Budget Cutting*, 2015 Ta. M.L.W. S. Ta. R., 10 (J. 17, 2015).

72 M. H.B. 72 (2015).

MARYLAND’S REACTION TO DECISION

W... Ma... \$201.6... \$25,000... W... 2006... 70 I... \$43... \$24.2... M... C... 71

A... Ma... G... A... A... B... R... A... 2015⁷²... Wynne... Ma 18, All. G... Ma 29, C...

73 T. All. G... S... C... Ma... 74 T... A... Ma... 75 a... C... 76 W... G... A... 2014... 13%... Wynne... 2015, ba... F... R... Ba... 77... 3%... C... ba... 78... T... Ma... O... 79... F... 10,000... 80

73 L... All... G... B... E... F... P... V.R. F... a... C... Ma... Ma 29, 2015.

74 *Id.*... Wynne at 1806.

75 M. H.B. 72... 4... 26 (2015), a... M... C... A... Ta-G... 10-703. S... 4... Wynne... 26... 4... b... Wynne... Ma... 76 *Id.* S... 27... Wynne... 77 M. S.B. 172 (2014), a... M... C... A... Ta-G... 13-604.

78 I... Ma... G... Ma... O’Ma... Ma 14, 2014, L... All... G... D... Ga... a... Ma... C... A... a... a... b...

