Pomeroy v. Commissioner, 53 T. C. 423 (1969)

Once a taxpayer elects a method of reporting income, they are bound by that election and cannot change it upon audit, even if the computation was inaccurate.

Summary

In Pomeroy v. Commissioner, the taxpayer elected the installment method to report the sale of real estate on his 1965 tax return but later sought to change to another method upon audit, arguing his original computation was incorrect. The Tax Court ruled that Pomeroy was bound by his initial election to use the installment method, rejecting his attempt to switch methods. The court emphasized that a valid election, even if incorrectly computed, cannot be retroactively changed. This case underscores the importance of carefully choosing tax reporting methods and the binding nature of such elections.

Facts

In 1965, Pomeroy sold a residence for $11,500 and elected the installment method on his tax return. He incorrectly computed the recognized gain at $1,000. Upon audit, the IRS determined the correct gain should be $3,123. 09. Pomeroy then claimed he did not elect the installment method but intended to report under an "open contract account" or deferred-payment method. He argued the sale was still an open deal due to unresolved mortgage issues.

Procedural History

Pomeroy filed his 1965 tax return reporting the sale using the installment method. Upon audit, the IRS challenged his computation of gain but accepted the method. Pomeroy contested this in Tax Court, seeking to change his reporting method. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's position, ruling that Pomeroy was bound by his initial election.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a taxpayer, having elected the installment method of reporting income from the sale of real estate, can renounce that method and choose a different one upon audit.
2. Whether the taxpayer's failure to file a timely return was due to reasonable cause.

Holding

1. No, because once a taxpayer elects a method of reporting income, they are bound by that election and cannot change it upon audit, even if the computation was inaccurate.
2. No, because the taxpayer's delay in filing was not due to reasonable cause as defined by the tax regulations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied section 453 of the Internal Revenue Code and the corresponding regulations, which allow taxpayers to elect the installment method for reporting income from real estate sales. Pomeroy’s return clearly indicated his election of this method, fulfilling the legal requirements. The court cited Pacific National Co. v. Welch, emphasizing that once a method is elected, it cannot be changed to another method that might result in lower taxes. The court rejected Pomeroy’s claim of an “open contract account” or deferred-payment method, noting that his return explicitly stated an installment election. Regarding the second issue, the court found that Pomeroy’s delay in filing was not due to reasonable cause, as he had ample time to prepare his return and seek assistance if needed. The court also dismissed Pomeroy’s attempt to offset the addition to tax with an overpayment from a previous year, as it was not applicable under the relevant tax provisions.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of carefully choosing tax reporting methods, as elections are binding upon audit. Taxpayers must ensure their initial election is correct and fully considered, as subsequent changes are not permitted. For legal practitioners, this case highlights the need to advise clients thoroughly on the implications of different reporting methods before filing. Businesses should implement robust tax planning to avoid similar issues. Subsequent cases, such as Ackerman v. United States, have reinforced this principle, emphasizing the finality of tax elections.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.