9 T.C. 1156 (1947)

When a taxpayer fails to keep adequate records of income, particularly from illegal sources, the IRS can determine income by calculating 'excess cash expenditures'—the difference between ascertainable cash expenditures and ascertainable cash receipts.

Summary

Max Cohen, involved in illegal gambling and liquor businesses, failed to maintain adequate income records. The IRS determined deficiencies by calculating "excess cash expenditures." Cohen challenged this, claiming errors in the IRS's calculations. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's method and most of its determinations, finding Cohen's explanations unconvincing, especially given his failure to testify. The court found fraud in most years due to Cohen's intentional underreporting, but allowed a credit for a proven loan in 1942. This case demonstrates how the IRS can reconstruct income in the absence of proper records and the consequences of failing to rebut the IRS's determinations.

Facts

Max Cohen derived income from illegal activities like operating night clubs, slot machines, and a "handbook" for horse racing. He kept no reliable records of this income. The IRS determined deficiencies by calculating "excess cash expenditures," which involved deducting ascertainable cash receipts from ascertainable cash expenditures. Cohen challenged the accuracy of the IRS's calculations, alleging uncounted cash receipts and loans.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Cohen's income tax, income and victory tax, and penalties for the years 1936-1943. Cohen petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the deficiencies and penalties. The Tax Court consolidated Cohen's case with related cases. The Tax Court ultimately upheld most of the Commissioner's determinations, but adjusted the deficiency for 1942 to account for a loan Cohen had proven.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Commissioner erred in determining that Cohen received additional taxable income which he failed to report, based on the excess of cash expenditures over reported cash receipts?
2. Whether the Commissioner erred in determining that Cohen received additional taxable income from Ray Watson which he failed to report?
3. Whether the Commissioner erred in determining that the income tax deficiencies were due to fraud?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because Cohen failed to disprove the correctness of the Commissioner's determination of "excess cash expenditures," except for a $25,000 loan in 1942.
2. Yes for 1941, No for 1942 and 1943; because the court found that Cohen had correctly reported income from Watson in 1941, but not in 1942 and 1943.
3. Yes, for the years 1936-1939, 1941 and 1942, because Cohen intentionally failed to report income, demonstrating a fraudulent purpose; No for 1940 and 1943, because there was insufficient evidence to prove fraud for those years.

Court's Reasoning

The court emphasized that Cohen bore the burden of disproving the Commissioner's deficiency determination. Because Cohen kept inadequate records, the IRS was justified in using the "excess cash expenditures" method. The court noted that Cohen's failure to testify created a presumption that his testimony would be unfavorable. The court found Cohen's explanations for discrepancies unconvincing. Regarding the alleged $35,000 loan from his mother-in-law, the court deemed the testimony false because no record of the loan existed and the loan was never mentioned until the hearing. The court credited Cohen with a $25,000 loan in 1942 because the evidence (a note and bank records) supported its existence. The court determined Cohen filed fraudulent returns for several years, pointing to his failure to report substantial income from illegal activities. As the court stated, "A failure to report for taxation income unquestionably received, such action being predicated on a patently lame and untenable excuse, would seem to permit of no difference of opinion. It evidences a fraudulent purpose."

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the IRS's power to reconstruct income when taxpayers fail to keep adequate records, particularly when dealing with illegal activities. It reinforces the taxpayer's burden to disprove IRS determinations, especially when the taxpayer chooses not to testify. It demonstrates that a plea of nolo contendere to tax evasion charges can be used as evidence of fraud. The

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.