17 T.C. 294 (1951)

Prepaid subscription income is taxable in the year received, even if the publisher uses a hybrid accounting method, due to the 'claim of right' doctrine and the requirements of Internal Revenue Code sections 41 and 42.

Summary

Booth Newspapers, Inc., a newspaper publisher using a hybrid accounting method, sought to defer reporting prepaid subscription income until the year of newspaper delivery. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies, arguing the prepaid amounts should be included in income in the year of receipt. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner, holding that the 'claim of right' doctrine requires income to be recognized when received without restriction, regardless of when services are performed. This decision reinforces the principle that cash-basis taxpayers must generally recognize income when they receive it.

Facts

Booth Newspapers, Inc. published daily newspapers and used a cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting, except for prepaid subscriptions. The company deferred recognizing prepaid subscription revenue until the newspapers were delivered. The company maintained a liability account titled "Paid in Advance Subscriptions." Amounts received for advance subscriptions were deposited into the general cash account and could be refunded upon request.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Booth Newspapers' excess profits tax and declared value excess-profits tax for the years 1942-1944. Booth Newspapers challenged the Commissioner's inclusion of prepaid subscription income in the year of receipt. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether the Commissioner erred in including in income for each of the taxable years the amounts received by the petitioner in those years as paid in advance subscriptions for newspapers to be delivered in the succeeding year.

Holding

Yes, because under the "claim of right" theory, the amount paid each year for subscriptions must be reported in the full amount received, even if some part might later have to be refunded. Also, Internal Revenue Code sections 41 and 42 require the inclusion in income of the full amount of the subscription price in the year received.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court relied on the “claim of right” doctrine, citing *North American Oil Consolidated v. Burnet*, which states that if a taxpayer receives earnings under a claim of right and without restriction as to its disposition, it constitutes taxable income. The court noted that Booth Newspapers had unrestricted use of the prepaid subscription money. The Court also cited *United States v. Lewis*, reinforcing the continued validity of the “claim of right” doctrine. The court referenced Internal Revenue Code sections 41 and 42, requiring income to be recognized in the year received unless a different accounting method clearly reflects income, which the court found the hybrid method did not. The court stated, “As the petitioner’s accounts were kept on the cash basis, section 42 requires that it should account for all items of gross income in the ‘year in which received.’ Section 41 in such a situation does not engraft on section 42 any permissible exception.” The court rejected the argument that consistent past practices estopped the Commissioner from making a correct determination. The court emphasized that there was no duplication of income under the Commissioner’s determination.

Practical Implications

Booth Newspapers establishes that prepaid income received by a cash-basis taxpayer is generally taxable in the year received, solidifying the “claim of right” doctrine. This case clarifies that even a long-standing practice of deferring income is insufficient justification if it conflicts with established tax principles. It impacts businesses with subscription models or advance payments, requiring them to recognize income upon receipt unless they meet stringent requirements for deferral under specific accounting methods, such as the accrual method. Later cases distinguish *Booth Newspapers* by focusing on whether the taxpayer had unfettered control over the funds or if there were substantial restrictions affecting the claim of right.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.