## Muldoon v. Commissioner, 55 T. C. 1551 (1971)

The date a tax deficiency notice is mailed by the IRS, not the date it is received by the taxpayer, determines the start of the 90-day period for filing a petition with the Tax Court.

#### Summary

In Muldoon v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether a petition was timely filed within 90 days from the mailing of a tax deficiency notice. The notice, sent by the IRS on June 18, 1969, was received by the taxpayer with the numbers "7-4" written on it, suggesting a possible July 4 mailing date. The court, however, found that the IRS provided substantial evidence that the notice was indeed mailed on June 18, as per their standard mailing procedures and records. The court dismissed the petition as untimely, emphasizing that the taxpayer's evidence was insufficient to rebut the IRS's proof of the mailing date. This case underscores the importance of the mailing date in determining the Tax Court's jurisdiction and the necessity of following strict statutory deadlines.

### Facts

On June 18, 1969, the IRS mailed a notice of deficiency to the petitioner at his lastknown address in Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts. The notice was sent by certified mail, and the 90-day period for filing a petition with the Tax Court expired on September 16, 1969. The petitioner mailed his petition on September 17, 1969, and it was received and filed by the court on September 18, 1969. The envelope containing the notice had the numbers "7-4" written on it, which the petitioner argued indicated a mailing date of July 4, 1969. The IRS presented evidence of its standard mailing procedures and records indicating the notice was mailed on June 18, 1969.

#### **Procedural History**

The respondent filed a motion to dismiss the petition for lack of jurisdiction on October 30, 1969, due to the petition being filed outside the 90-day statutory period. After a hearing on May 25, 1970, and subsequent submission of evidence and briefs, the Tax Court ruled on the motion.

# Issue(s)

1. Whether the tax deficiency notice was mailed by the IRS on June 18, 1969, as opposed to July 4, 1969, as suggested by the numbers on the envelope.

# Holding

1. Yes, because the IRS provided substantial evidence that the notice was mailed on June 18, 1969, following their standard mailing procedures, and the taxpayer's

evidence was insufficient to rebut this.

#### **Court's Reasoning**

The court applied the legal rule that the 90-day period for filing a petition with the Tax Court begins from the date the deficiency notice is mailed, not when it is received by the taxpayer. The IRS presented detailed evidence of its mailing procedures, including the use of certified mail, logging of mailing numbers, and verification by the Post Office. This evidence included testimony from the IRS mail clerk and Post Office records, which corroborated the June 18 mailing date. The court found the petitioner's evidence, the numbers "7-4" on the envelope, to be inconclusive and insufficient to rebut the IRS's proof. The court also noted that July 4, 1969, was a holiday, making it unlikely that mail was processed on that date. The court emphasized the importance of adhering to statutory deadlines and the necessity for taxpayers to provide clear evidence to challenge the IRS's proof mailing.

### **Practical Implications**

This decision reinforces the critical importance of the mailing date of a tax deficiency notice in determining the jurisdiction of the Tax Court. It underscores that the burden is on the taxpayer to provide clear and substantial evidence to challenge the IRS's proof of mailing. Practically, this case affects how taxpayers and their legal representatives must approach the filing of petitions, ensuring they are filed within the strict 90-day period from the IRS's documented mailing date. It also highlights the need for the IRS to maintain rigorous mailing procedures and documentation to support their position in court. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this principle, emphasizing the importance of the mailing date in tax deficiency cases.