Fairfax Mutual Wood Products Co. v. Commissioner, 5 T.C. 1279 (1946)

A taxpayer's failure to file a tax return is excused for reasonable cause when the taxpayer relies on the advice of a competent government official after fully disclosing all relevant facts.

Summary

Fairfax Mutual Wood Products Co. failed to file an excess profits tax return. The IRS assessed a penalty. The company argued that its failure to file was due to reasonable cause because it relied on advice from the local collector's office that it was considered a personal service corporation and thus exempt. The Tax Court held that the penalty was not justified because the company's officers had fully discussed the matter with the collector and his subordinates, and the company acted in good faith reliance on their advice. The key factor was the full disclosure of information and the reasonable reliance on advice from someone with apparent authority.

Facts

Fairfax Mutual Wood Products Co. was a corporation. Its officers refrained from filing an excess profits tax return. The president of the company discussed the matter with the local tax collector's office. He and his subordinates advised the company that it was considered a personal service corporation and not required to file. The company then attached a statement to its return explaining the absence of the excess profits tax return, citing the advice received. The IRS subsequently determined that the company was liable for excess profits tax and assessed penalties for failure to file.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a penalty against Fairfax Mutual Wood Products Co. for failure to file an excess profits tax return. Fairfax Mutual Wood Products Co. petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency, arguing that its failure to file was due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect. The Tax Court reviewed the evidence and the relevant law to determine if the penalty was justified.

Issue(s)

Whether the taxpayer's failure to file an excess profits tax return was "due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect" when the taxpayer relied on advice from the local collector's office that it was not required to file such a return.

Holding

No, because the officers of the corporation refrained from filing an excess profits tax return on the advice of the local collector's office after fully disclosing all relevant

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

facts, the imposition of the penalty was not justified.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the corporation had acted reasonably in relying on the advice of the local collector’s office. The court emphasized that the president of the company had fully discussed the matter with the collector and his subordinates. Based on their advice, the company attached a statement to the return explaining why it was not filing an excess profits tax return. The court distinguished the case from situations where the taxpayer relied on its own belief that no return was required or where the advice was obtained from an unqualified advisor. The court concluded that under these specific circumstances, the corporation did not willfully neglect to file the return, and the imposition of the penalty was not justified. The court, in reaching its holding, considered that the taxpayer had made a good faith effort to comply with the law and had relied on the advice of those who should have been knowledgeable about the requirements.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates that taxpayers can avoid penalties for failure to file a tax return if they can demonstrate reasonable cause. Reasonable cause can be established by showing that the taxpayer relied on the advice of a competent professional or government official after fully disclosing all relevant facts. This reliance must be in good faith. Taxpayers should document the advice they receive and the information they provide to advisors. This case is frequently cited when taxpayers argue they relied on professional advice, but it also highlights the importance of ensuring that the advisor is competent and fully informed. Later cases have distinguished Fairfax by emphasizing the taxpayer’s responsibility to provide complete and accurate information to the advisor. The principle extends beyond the specific context of excess profits tax returns, applying to various tax filing requirements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.