14 T.C. 943 (1950)

The tax table in Section 400 of the Internal Revenue Code, used for taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes under $5,000, effectively taxes “net income” by incorporating a standard deduction and personal exemptions.

Summary

Gussie P. Chapman challenged a tax deficiency, arguing that the tax table in Section 400 of the Internal Revenue Code improperly taxed her adjusted gross income rather than her net income. The Tax Court upheld the deficiency, explaining that the tax table accounts for standard deductions and personal exemptions, approximating the outcome of calculating tax on net income using standard methods. The court clarified that allowing itemized deductions in addition to using the tax table would result in an unintended double deduction.

Facts

Gussie P. Chapman, a file clerk for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, reported a salary of $1,606.27 in 1946. She claimed $132.41 in itemized deductions, including contributions, real estate taxes, telephone tolls, a theft loss, and medical expenses. Chapman computed her tax using a combination of methods, resulting in a claimed tax liability of $66.50 and requested a refund. The IRS determined that some of her deductions were not allowable and recomputed her tax using the tax table in Section 400, resulting in a higher tax liability of $181.

Procedural History

The IRS initially refunded Chapman $127.40. After an audit, the IRS issued a 30-day letter and then a statutory notice of deficiency for $114.50. Chapman petitioned the Tax Court, challenging the deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether the tax table contained in Section 400 of the Internal Revenue Code improperly imposes tax on adjusted gross income rather than net income, thereby denying the taxpayer the benefit of itemized deductions and credits.

Holding

No, because the tax table in Section 400 effectively taxes net income by incorporating standard deductions (approximately 10% of gross income) and personal exemptions, as intended by Congress.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that Sections 11 and 12 of the Internal Revenue Code impose tax

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

on net income, but Section 400 provides an alternative tax calculation for individuals with adjusted gross income less than $5,000. While Section 400 refers to “net income,” the tax table uses adjusted gross income as a starting point. However, the court emphasized that the tax table is designed to approximate the result of calculating tax on net income. It incorporates an automatic allowance equal to approximately 10% of the taxpayer’s gross income and also accounts for personal exemptions. Allowing taxpayers to itemize deductions and then use the tax table would create a double deduction, which was not the intent of Congress. As the court noted, “The practical effect of permitting the petitioner to itemize her deductions as if she were computing her tax under sections 11 and 12 and thereafter to use the tax table provided for in section 400, embodying the automatic allowance for the same deductions, would be to give her the benefit of double deductions.”

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that taxpayers eligible to use the tax table in Section 400 cannot also claim itemized deductions. It confirms that the tax table is a simplified method of calculating tax liability that already accounts for a standard level of deductions and exemptions. Legal practitioners must advise clients that using the tax table precludes them from itemizing. This case also limits arguments that the tax table is unconstitutional or otherwise improper because it does not literally tax “net income,” emphasizing that it achieves the same practical effect. The case serves as a reminder of the balance between simplicity and accuracy in tax law, highlighting that Congress can create simplified methods that reasonably approximate more complex calculations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.