Reineke v. Commissioner, 1953 Tax Ct. Memo LEXIS 231 (1953)

A taxpayer's election to deduct a war loss under Section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code is binding and cannot be retroactively rescinded through an amended return filed years later, even if the taxpayer seeks to avoid reporting the recovery of such loss in a subsequent year.

Summary

The petitioner, Reineke, sought to withdraw a war loss deduction he had previously claimed in 1942, related to bonds held in Philippine Railway Co., the property which was seized by the Japanese. He filed a "third amended return" almost three and a half years after the original due date, aiming to avoid reporting the recovery of this loss in a later year as required by Section 127(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court held that the initial election to take the war loss deduction was binding. Allowing the withdrawal would disrupt the principle of strict annual accounting and hinder the orderly administration of tax laws.

Facts

- The Philippine Railway Co. property was captured by the Japanese in 1942.
- Reineke held bonds in the Philippine Railway Co.
- Reineke deducted a war loss related to these bonds on his 1942 tax return, after requesting and receiving a ruling from the IRS that this was permissible under Section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code.
- Reineke adhered to this deduction in two subsequent amended returns.
- Years later, Reineke attempted to file a "third amended return" to withdraw the war loss deduction. His motivation was to avoid the requirement of reporting the recovery of the loss in a later year, as mandated by Section 127(c).

Procedural History

The Commissioner disallowed Reineke's attempt to withdraw the war loss deduction via the third amended return. Reineke then petitioned the Tax Court for review of the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether a taxpayer, having elected to deduct a war loss under Section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code in a prior year, can retroactively withdraw that election through a later-filed amended return to avoid the consequences of reporting the recovery of that loss in a subsequent year.

Holding

No, because a taxpayer's election to take a war loss deduction is binding and cannot

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

be retroactively rescinded years later, as doing so would undermine the principle of strict annual accounting and disrupt the orderly administration of tax laws.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized the importance of the annual accounting system in taxation, citing *Security Flour Mills Co. v. Commissioner, 321 U.S. 281*. The Court stated, "It is the essence of any system of taxation that it should produce revenue ascertainable, and payable to the government, at regular intervals. Only by such a system is it practicable to produce a regular flow of income and apply methods of accounting, assessment and collection capable of practical operation." The court reasoned that allowing taxpayers to change their minds years after the initial return would create confusion and uncertainty. Analogizing to cases where taxpayers attempted to switch from joint to separate returns after the due date, the court quoted *Champlin v. Commissioner, 78 Fed. (2d) 905*, stating, "To permit taxpayers to change their minds ad libitum for fifteen years would throw the department into inextricable confusion. The general rule is that where a taxpayer has exercised an option conferred by statute he cannot retro-actively and ex parte rescind his action." Therefore, the court concluded that Reineke's initial election to deduct the war loss was binding.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that tax elections, once made, are generally irrevocable. Taxpayers must carefully consider the implications of their elections at the time they file their returns. This decision prevents taxpayers from using amended returns to retroactively manipulate prior tax years to their advantage, especially when attempting to avoid the consequences of a prior election. It confirms the IRS's interest in maintaining a stable and predictable revenue stream, which relies on consistent application of tax laws and adherence to the annual accounting period.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.