18 T.C. 1263 (1952)

A taxpayer must make an affirmative election on a timely filed income tax return to report a sale of property on the installment method; failure to do so precludes later claiming the benefit of installment reporting.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed several tax issues related to the petitioner's sale of a dairy farm and related property. The key issue was whether the petitioner could report the capital gain from the sale on the installment method, despite not electing to do so on their 1943 tax return. The court held that because the petitioner failed to make a clear election to use the installment method in the year of the sale, they could not later claim its benefits. The court also addressed issues related to a land exchange, the statute of limitations, and negligence penalties.

Facts

In 1943, the Scales executed a deed and bill of sale to Barran and Winton for a dairy farm, herd, and personal property, receiving promissory notes. Barran and Winton took immediate possession. The agreement included a leaseback arrangement to facilitate foreclosure. Payments were not made as agreed. In 1943, the Scales received $5,250.03 cash from Barran and Winton. On their 1943 tax return, the Scales reported the $5,250.03 as "Rent of Farm Lands" without mentioning the sale.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies for 1943 and 1947. The taxpayer petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the deficiencies and penalties. The key point of contention was the method of reporting the capital gain from the 1943 sale.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayer could report the capital gain from the 1943 sale on the installment method, given the failure to elect this method on the 1943 tax return.
2. Whether there was capital gain on the exchange of 98.72 acres of land in 1943.
3. Whether the taxpayer omitted more than 25% of gross income, triggering the 5-year statute of limitations.
4. Whether a 5% negligence penalty should be applied to 1943.
5. Whether the petitioner realized taxable income in 1947 from interest or feed sales, and whether a negligence penalty is applicable.

Holding

1. No, because the taxpayer failed to make an affirmative election to report the sale on the installment method in the 1943 return.
2. Yes, the taxpayer realized a long-term capital gain of $1,622 in 1943 because the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

basis was determined to be $8,250 and the total consideration was $9,872.
3. Yes, because the taxpayer omitted more than 25% of their gross income.
4. No, because the deficiency for 1943 was not due to negligence.
5. No, because the consolidated note was not the equivalent of cash or accepted as payment.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on the principle that taxpayers must make a clear and affirmative election on their tax return to use the installment method. Citing *Pacific Nat'l. Co. v. Welch*, the court emphasized that failing to initially report a sale on the installment basis prevents a taxpayer from later changing their method. The court distinguished *United States v. Eversman*, noting that in that case, the return included a complete disclosure of all relevant facts, which was not the case here. The court stated: "when benefits are sought by taxpayers, meticulous compliance with all the named conditions of the statute is required, and that in the case of section 44, timely and affirmative action is required on the part of those seeking the advantages of reporting upon the installment basis." The court found that reporting the cash received as "Rent of Farm Lands" was insufficient to put the Commissioner on notice of the sale or an intent to use the installment method. The court also addressed the statute of limitations issue, finding that the taxpayer omitted more than 25% of their gross income, triggering the extended 5-year limitations period under Section 275(c) I.R.C.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of making a clear and timely election to use the installment method when selling property. Taxpayers must explicitly indicate their intent to report the sale on the installment basis on their tax return for the year of the sale. Failure to do so will preclude them from using the installment method in later years, potentially resulting in a larger tax liability in the year of the sale. This case serves as a reminder that ambiguous or incomplete disclosures are not sufficient to constitute an election. Practitioners should advise clients to clearly and explicitly elect the installment method on their tax returns to avoid future disputes with the IRS.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.