Draper Allen v. Commissioner, 28 T.C. 121 (1957)

A valid notice of deficiency for income tax purposes is sufficient if sent by registered mail to the taxpayer's last known address, even if the IRS fails to send a copy to the taxpayer's attorney, despite a power of attorney requesting such notification.

Summary

The case concerns whether the Tax Court had jurisdiction to hear a petition for redetermination of an income tax deficiency when the petition was filed outside the statutory 90-day period after the IRS mailed a notice of deficiency to the taxpayers. The taxpayers argued the period should be extended because the IRS failed to send a copy of the notice to their attorney as requested in a power of attorney. The Tax Court held that the mailing of a notice of deficiency to the taxpayers' last known address was sufficient, and the failure to send a copy to their attorney did not affect the filing deadline. Therefore, the petition, filed after the 90-day limit, was dismissed.

Facts

The IRS sent a statutory notice of deficiency to Draper and Florence Allen by registered mail on February 11, 1957, regarding their 1951 income tax. The Allens had filed a power of attorney with the IRS, requesting that copies of all communications be sent to their attorneys, Meisner and Meisner. The IRS sent a copy of a letter, which included the statement of deficiency, to the attorneys, but not a separate formal notice of deficiency. The Allens received a demand for payment on August 1, 1957, and attempted to file a petition for redetermination on August 19, 1957, well past the 90-day period from the initial notice.

Procedural History

The IRS determined a deficiency in the Allens' 1951 income tax. The IRS sent a notice of deficiency to the Allens on February 11, 1957. The Allens filed a motion for leave to file a petition for redetermination of the deficiency on August 19, 1957. The Tax Court denied the motion, finding the petition untimely.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction to hear the petition for redetermination when the petition was filed more than 90 days after the notice of deficiency was mailed to the taxpayers.
2. Whether the IRS's failure to send a copy of the notice of deficiency to the taxpayers' attorneys, as requested in a power of attorney, extends the 90-day filing period.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the notice of deficiency was mailed to the taxpayers at their last known address.
2. No, because the failure to send a copy to the attorneys does not affect the statutory deadline.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, particularly sections 6212(a) and (b)(1), which state that a notice of deficiency is sufficient if mailed to the taxpayer's last known address, absent notice of a fiduciary relationship. The court found that the attorneys did not act in a fiduciary capacity. The court stated, "We know of no statutory provision under which we could hold such a notice, thus declared by statute to be sufficient, to be insufficient to mark the beginning of the period for filing prescribed by section 6213 (a) because the respondent failed to send a copy of such notice to one other than the taxpayer even if requested by the taxpayer to do so by as formal a document as a power of attorney." The court rejected the Allens' argument that the IRS's failure to send a copy to the attorneys somehow tolled or extended the filing deadline, because the statutory notice to the taxpayers was valid.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of timely filing petitions for redetermination. Attorneys must ensure they have the correct last known address for their clients and must monitor their clients' mail for notices of deficiency. A power of attorney requesting copies of communications does not supersede statutory notice requirements. Practitioners should not rely on receiving copies of notices sent to their clients as a failsafe. Furthermore, the case underscores that the IRS has fulfilled its obligations once the notice is delivered to the last known address of the taxpayer even if the taxpayer's attorney does not receive a copy of the notice. If an attorney is representing a client and the notice of deficiency is not received by the attorney, it remains the client's responsibility to meet deadlines.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.