Nixon Re-audited in Light Of Appraiser's Conviction JAN 21 1976 NYTimes

By NICHOLAS M. HORROCK Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 20- Ralph G. Newman, a litemine if he is liable for fraud with the back-dating. penalties, according to sources Edward L. Morgan, a former familiar with the matter.

out of Government, said that guilty in 1974 to tax fraud conthe pardon granted by Presi-dent Ford protects Mr. Nixon four months in prison. The from being prosecuted for tax Watergate special prosecutors fraud or any other criminal charged and brought Mr. Nixon's action while he was serving tax lawyer, Frank Demarco, to trial, but he was acquitted of sources said, the I.R.S. re-similar charges. audit is aimed at determining whether the agency should as- the sources said, is to detersess fraud penalties against mine whether Mr. Nixon was Mr. Nixon in connection with aware of or involved in the efthe conspiracy to back-date fort to back-date documents documents in claiming the de-

duction.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 20 Kaiph G. Ivewinan, a inco-The Internal Revenue Service rary scholar whose appraisal has begun a re-audit of former of the value of the Vice Presi-President Richard M. Nixon's dential papers provided the tax returns for the years in basis for the deduction, was which he claimed a \$450,000 convicted and fined earlier deduction for the gift of his this month on charges of ly-Vice-Presidential papers to the ing to the I.R.S. and preparing National Archives, to deter- a false affidavit in connection

Treasury Department and These sources, both in and White House aide, pleaded

The purpose of the re-audit,

Continued on Page 27, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 4

that made it possible for him to claim a tax deduction for donating the Vice-Presidential papers to the archives.

If the I.R.S. determined that Mr. Nixon was aware of or involved in an attempt to defraud the agency it could assess a 50 percent fraud penalty for 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972. These were the years in which Mr. Nixon claimed the tax de-duction. There is no statute of limitations on civil fraud cases, according to tax authorities

according to tax authorities. When the back-dating of the deed of Mr. Nixon's Vice-Presidential papers became known, Mr. Nixon lost the \$450,000 deduction for the gift.

it could cost Mr. Nixon as much as \$175,000, plus interest, one source said.

Mr. Nixon's lawyers declined to comment on the report of the re-audit as did a spokesman for the I.R.S. The agency doutinely refuses to discuss any individual's tax return.

According to sources familiar with the Watergate special presecutor's investigation, Mr. Nixon was not asked about his gift of the papers to the ar-chives and its tax implications

his aides were falsifying decu-ments to get him a tax break. Publicly, he denied any com-plicity in a scheme to back-date

Harm to Public Image

Up to \$175,000 Penalty Mr. Nixon paid additional taxes for 1970, 1971 and 1972. He was also assessed a 5 per-titional tax bill came to some \$282,000. He was also found to be \$282,000. He was also found to be pledged to pay this amount-there was no negligence penalty involved—but to date there is no indication that the bill has be ansessed for the four years Harm to Public Image Mr. Nixon's tax problems arose in the middle of the Watergate investigation and from the beginning appeared to be almost as detrimental to his public image and future in the Presidency as the Watergate Mr. Nixon made a gift of papers to the archives, valued at \$576,000 By Mr. Newman, and supported by a deed dated Mr. Nixon to make four deduc-tions for charitable contribu-tions over four years.