Bunnel v. Commissioner, 50 T. C. 837 (1968)

A notice of deficiency need not be mailed to a subchapter S corporation for adjustments affecting shareholders' income, and oil leases sold by dealers are not eligible for capital gains treatment.

Summary

In Bunnel v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed two primary issues: the validity of deficiency notices sent to shareholders of a subchapter S corporation without also being sent to the corporation itself, and the tax treatment of income from oil lease sales. The court ruled that notices of deficiency sent directly to shareholders were valid under the Internal Revenue Code, as the corporation was not subject to income tax due to its subchapter S election. Additionally, the court determined that the oil leases sold by the Bunnels and their corporation were held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business, thus disqualifying the income from capital gains treatment. The court also found the taxpayers negligent in underreporting their taxes, warranting an addition to the tax.

Facts

Robert L. Bunnel and Vola V. Bunnel formed Senemex, Inc. , a subchapter S corporation, to deal in oil and gas leases. They reported income from lease sales as capital gains on their personal tax returns for 1958, 1960, and 1961. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue challenged these reports, asserting deficiencies and additions to tax due to negligence. The Bunnels argued that the deficiency notices were invalid because they were not also sent to Senemex, and that the leases should be treated as capital assets.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued notices of deficiency to Robert L. Bunnel for 1958 and to Robert L. Bunnel and Vola V. Bunnel jointly for 1960 and 1961. The Bunnels petitioned the Tax Court to contest these deficiencies. The cases were consolidated for trial, where the court upheld the validity of the notices and the Commissioner's determination that the leases were held for sale in the ordinary course of business.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a notice of deficiency must be mailed to a subchapter S corporation for adjustments affecting shareholders' income.
2. Whether the oil leases sold by the Bunnels and Senemex were property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business.
3. Whether the Bunnels' underpayment of taxes was due to negligence.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the subchapter S election meant the corporation was not subject to income tax, making shareholders the direct taxpayers.
2. Yes, because the leases were part of the Bunnels' and Senemex's ongoing business activities, indicating they were held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business.
3. Yes, because the Bunnels failed to substantiate their deductions and conceded improper deductions on their returns.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the statutory requirement for a notice of deficiency to be sent to the "taxpayer" applies to those directly liable for the tax, which in this case were the shareholders due to the subchapter S election. The court rejected the Bunnels' argument that the corporation should also have received a notice, citing that such an interpretation would lead to absurd results, especially since the corporation was not liable for income tax.
Regarding the oil leases, the court found that the Bunnels and Senemex were engaged in the business of dealing in oil leases, as evidenced by their frequent buying and selling of leases, their listing in telephone directories under oil-related categories, and their use of options to facilitate these transactions. The court determined that the leases were not held for investment but were part of the Bunnels' ongoing business operations, disqualifying the income from capital gains treatment.
On the issue of negligence, the court noted that the Bunnels conceded several improper deductions without offering any evidence to support their claims. The court held that the Bunnels' failure to substantiate these deductions constituted negligence, justifying the addition to tax under Section 6653(a).

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that deficiency notices for subchapter S corporations need only be sent to shareholders, simplifying the process for the IRS and reducing potential delays in tax assessments. It also underscores the importance of correctly classifying income from the sale of property, particularly in industries like oil and gas where dealers may seek to claim capital gains treatment. Taxpayers must be diligent in substantiating their deductions to avoid negligence penalties. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling in similar contexts, reinforcing the need for clear distinctions between investment and business activities in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.