24 T.C. 525 (1955)

A loss deduction for theft requires evidence from which a reasonable inference of theft can be drawn; mere disappearance is insufficient.

Summary

In Jones v. Commissioner, the U.S. Tax Court addressed whether a taxpayer could deduct a loss due to theft of jewelry. Ethel Jones claimed a deduction for the loss of a diamond and sapphire bar pin. The court had to determine if the facts presented supported a reasonable inference of theft, distinguishing the case from a prior ruling where a brooch had simply disappeared. The court found that the circumstances, including the pin's secure storage, the maid's access, and the subsequent disappearance of both the pin and the maid, supported a theft deduction. The court determined the pin's basis based on its fair market value at the time of the gift, allowing a portion of the claimed deduction.

Facts

Ethel Jones received a diamond and sapphire bar pin as a wedding gift from Rodman Wanamaker. The pin, worth approximately $3,000, was insured and later stored in a locked compartment in her home. The key was accessible to her maid. After Ethel left for a hospital stay and a funeral, both the pin and the maid were gone. There was no evidence of forced entry, but the pin was never recovered. Jones filed a tax return claiming a deduction for theft of the jewelry.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the Joneses' income tax, disallowing the deduction for the lost jewelry. The Joneses petitioned the U.S. Tax Court to challenge the disallowance. The Tax Court had to determine if the loss was indeed due to theft.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the evidence presented supported a finding that the pin was lost due to theft, thus entitling the taxpayers to a deduction.

2. If the loss was due to theft, what was the basis of the pin to determine the deductible amount.

Holding

1. Yes, because the facts provided a reasonable inference that the pin was stolen.

2. Yes, because the court could estimate the basis using the fair market value at the time of the gift.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court distinguished the case from *Mary Frances Allen, 16 T.C. 163*, where a brooch simply disappeared. The court emphasized that the taxpayer bears the burden of proving the article was stolen. It stated, “If the reasonable inferences from the evidence point to theft, the proponent is entitled to prevail.” In *Jones*, the court found that the secured storage of the pin, its subsequent disappearance along with the maid who had access, and the lack of evidence of any other explanation, reasonably led to the inference of theft. The court then addressed the basis issue, noting that while the original cost to the donor was unknown, the pin had a fair market value at the time of the gift, which could be used to determine its basis.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of presenting sufficient factual evidence to support a theft claim for tax deduction purposes. Merely showing a missing item is insufficient. Circumstantial evidence pointing towards theft, such as secure storage, unauthorized access, and the disappearance of a person with access, will strengthen a claim. The case also shows that where original cost isn’t known, fair market value can be used to establish basis in cases involving gifts. Taxpayers and their advisors should document circumstances surrounding a loss, especially if theft is suspected, to enhance the likelihood of a successful deduction claim. The distinction from *Mary Frances Allen* clarifies that the court requires a reasonable inference of theft, not merely a disappearance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.