31 T.C. 56 (1958)

When a taxpayer's records are inadequate to determine the exact costs of goods sold, a court may estimate those costs based on available evidence, even if the evidence is not entirely precise.

Summary

The United States Tax Court considered consolidated cases of Nathan and Isidor Goldsmith, partners in a wholesale business, who were accused of tax deficiencies due to unreported sales. The core issue involved determining the cost of goods sold related to these unrecorded sales. The court, while finding the taxpayers' testimony about these sales to be unreliable, recognized that some costs were associated with them. Because the taxpayers' record-keeping was inadequate, the court applied the *Cohan* rule, a principle allowing for the estimation of deductible expenses when exact figures are unavailable due to the taxpayer's fault. Consequently, the court determined, based on the available, if imperfect, evidence, a specific cost figure for the merchandise sold, allowing a partially offsetting adjustment to the tax deficiencies. Additionally, the court upheld the assessment of fraud penalties, due to deliberate omission of income and destruction of records and denied some deductions due to the failure of the taxpayers to comply with Tax Court rules regarding pleading.

Facts

Nathan and Isidor Goldsmith were partners in the Manhattan Coffee and Sugar Company. During 1944 and 1945, the partnership engaged in unrecorded sales of flavored sugar syrups. The Goldsmiths did not include these sales in gross receipts on their tax returns, nor did they include the associated costs of goods sold. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in their income tax, including additions for fraud. The taxpayers contended that the unrecorded sales generated no profit because the cost of the syrup equaled the sales price, and the cost of the syrup was not reflected on the partnership books. The court, however, found the taxpayers' explanation of these transactions and the source of the syrup in question, to be untrustworthy. During the relevant periods, sugar and sugar products were subject to price regulations, and the partnership was found to have paid substantial commissions to brokers who facilitated the unrecorded sales. The taxpayers' books also showed a purchase journal, but the court was not satisfied that the claimed purchases matched the actual transactions.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the income tax of Nathan and Isidor Goldsmith, including penalties for fraud. The Goldsmiths petitioned the United States Tax Court to dispute the deficiencies. The Tax Court consolidated their cases for trial and issued a judgment that addressed the issues of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

unreported income, the proper amount of deductions, and the fraud penalties. The decisions would be entered under Rule 50.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the cost of merchandise sold by the partnership in fiscal years ending June 30, 1944 and 1945 was greater than the cost set forth on its income tax returns.

2. Whether the Commissioner was correct in refusing to take into account certain costs claimed on the 1947 returns.

3. Whether the partnership incurred deductible expenses in amounts greater than those allowed by the Commissioner.

4. Whether any part of the deficiency for 1944 or 1945 was due to fraud.

Holding

1. Yes, because, despite the absence of reliable records, the court found some costs were associated with the unreported sales and estimated them, applying the *Cohan* rule.

2. Yes, because the taxpayers' evidence supporting the claimed costs in 1947 was unsatisfactory.

3. No, because the taxpayers failed to comply with the Tax Court's rules regarding clear assignments of error and factual allegations in support of their claims.

4. Yes, because the evidence demonstrated deliberate omission of income, the destruction of records, and the Goldsmiths had pleaded guilty to tax evasion in the relevant periods.

Court's Reasoning

The court found that the Goldsmiths had engaged in unrecorded sales but disbelieved their testimony that these sales yielded no profit. The court stated, "We cannot find that Manhattan had unrecorded costs equal to the total of its unrecorded sales." The court noted that the burden of proof was on the taxpayers and that they had provided insufficient evidence to establish the correct cost of goods sold. However, because some costs were clearly associated with the unrecorded sales, the court invoked the principle articulated in *Cohan v. Commissioner*, stating that the court "should make as close an approximation as it can, bearing heavily if it chooses upon the taxpayer whose inexactitude is of his own making." Based on the available records and testimony, the court estimated the costs for 1944 and 1945, despite finding the evidence less than ideal. The court also denied deductions for travel, legal, and related expenses because the taxpayers failed to comply with the Tax

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s rules regarding proper assignments of error and factual support for their claims. Finally, the court upheld the fraud penalties, based on the strong evidence of deliberate omission of income, destruction of records and the taxpayers prior guilty pleas.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the application of the *Cohan* rule, which allows courts to estimate deductions when a taxpayer’s inadequate records preclude precise calculations. Attorneys should advise their clients about the critical importance of maintaining accurate and complete financial records to support claimed deductions. When a client’s record-keeping is deficient, the *Goldsmith* case offers a framework for attempting to estimate the costs and deductions. However, the attorney must prepare the best possible case, given the available evidence and the lack of good records, and anticipate that the court may resolve all doubts against the taxpayer due to their “inexactitude.” The case also reinforces the importance of following procedural rules, as failure to comply can result in the denial of legitimate claims, as demonstrated by the disallowed deductions for expenses.

Meta Description

The *Goldsmith* case demonstrates the application of the *Cohan* rule by the Tax Court in estimating costs of goods sold when taxpayers fail to keep adequate records and the importance of following court rules.

Tags

Goldsmith v. Commissioner, Tax Court, 1958, Cohan Rule, Unreported Income, Fraud, Cost of Goods Sold

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.