Samuel J. King, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 51 T. C. 851 (1969)

The Tax Court has jurisdiction to redetermine a tax deficiency if the Commissioner fails to assess or file a claim during the taxpayer's bankruptcy proceeding.

Summary

Samuel J. King, adjudicated bankrupt, received a notice of deficiency from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the taxable year 1962. King filed a timely petition with the Tax Court. The Commissioner moved to dismiss, arguing that the court lacked jurisdiction due to the ongoing bankruptcy. The Tax Court held it had jurisdiction since the Commissioner did not assess the deficiency or file a claim in the bankruptcy proceeding. This decision ensures taxpayers have an opportunity to challenge deficiencies in court, even during bankruptcy, if the Commissioner does not pursue collection within the bankruptcy process.

Facts

Samuel J. King filed for voluntary bankruptcy on April 4, 1963, and was adjudicated a bankrupt. On January 25, 1967, the Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency for King's 1962 income tax. King timely filed a petition with the Tax Court on April 25, 1967, and later an amended petition on June 30, 1967. King was discharged in bankruptcy on June 24, 1968, and the bankruptcy proceedings closed on August 2, 1968. The Commissioner neither assessed the deficiency nor filed a claim in the bankruptcy proceeding.

Procedural History

King filed for bankruptcy in the Federal District Court of the Western District of Missouri. After receiving the notice of deficiency, he petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination. The Commissioner moved to dismiss the petition, asserting the Tax Court lacked jurisdiction due to the ongoing bankruptcy. The Tax Court denied the Commissioner's motion, finding it had jurisdiction over the case.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction to redetermine a deficiency when the petition was filed after the taxpayer was adjudicated a bankrupt but before discharge and termination of the bankruptcy proceeding, and the Commissioner neither assessed the deficiency nor filed a claim in the bankruptcy proceeding.

Holding

1. Yes, because the Commissioner's failure to assess the deficiency or file a claim in the bankruptcy proceeding meant the taxpayer did not have an opportunity to litigate the deficiency in that forum, thus the Tax Court retains jurisdiction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court’s decision was based on the interpretation of Section 6871 of the Internal Revenue Code, which allows immediate assessment of deficiencies upon a taxpayer’s bankruptcy. However, the court emphasized that the “no petition” language in Section 6871(b) only applies when the Commissioner has taken action to assess the deficiency or file a claim in the bankruptcy court. The court cited *Pearl A. Orenduff* and *John V. Prather* to support its view that the Tax Court retains jurisdiction if the Commissioner does not provide the taxpayer an opportunity to litigate the deficiency in the bankruptcy court. The court reasoned that denying jurisdiction would leave the taxpayer without a forum to contest the deficiency before payment, which is inconsistent with the legislative intent to provide taxpayers an opportunity for judicial review. The court also considered policy implications, emphasizing the importance of providing taxpayers with an opportunity to challenge tax claims without payment.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for how tax deficiencies are handled during bankruptcy proceedings. It clarifies that the Tax Court retains jurisdiction over deficiency notices issued during bankruptcy if the Commissioner does not assess the tax or file a claim in the bankruptcy court. This ruling protects taxpayers’ rights to contest deficiencies judicially without payment, even during bankruptcy. Practitioners should be aware that if the Commissioner elects not to pursue collection through the bankruptcy process, taxpayers retain their right to petition the Tax Court for redetermination. This case has been influential in subsequent cases, reinforcing the principle that the Tax Court’s jurisdiction is not automatically barred by ongoing bankruptcy proceedings unless the Commissioner takes specific action within the bankruptcy process.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.