Deaktor v. Commissioner, 59 T. C. 841 (1973)

Taxpayers must prove they received a notice of deficiency after the statute of limitations period to establish a defense based on limitations.

Summary

In Deaktor v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed the burden of proof concerning the receipt of a notice of deficiency when it was sent to an incorrect address. The petitioners argued that the notice was defective due to the incorrect address, and thus, the Commissioner should bear the burden of proving actual receipt before the statute of limitations expired. The court held that the petitioners failed to meet their burden of proof by not showing they received the notice after the limitations period, leading to the denial of their motion to strike the Commissioner's answer. This case underscores the importance of taxpayers proving the timing of receipt when challenging the validity of a notice of deficiency on statute of limitations grounds.

Facts

On August 13, 1971, the Commissioner mailed a notice of deficiency for the taxable year 1967 to the Deaktors at an incorrect address, despite knowing their correct address. The statute of limitations for assessment was set to expire on September 15, 1971. The Deaktors received the notice before filing a petition on September 29, 1971, alleging the notice was improperly addressed and challenging the deficiency determination. They moved to strike the Commissioner's answer, arguing the notice's defectiveness shifted the burden of proof to the Commissioner to prove actual receipt before the limitations period expired.

Procedural History

The Deaktors filed a petition with the Tax Court on September 29, 1971, after receiving the notice of deficiency. The Commissioner responded and admitted the notice was sent to an incorrect address. The Deaktors then moved to strike the Commissioner's answer, claiming the notice's defectiveness placed the burden on the Commissioner to prove actual receipt before the statute of limitations expired. The Tax Court held hearings on this matter and ultimately denied the Deaktors' motion.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayers must prove they received the notice of deficiency after the expiration of the statute of limitations to establish a defense based on limitations?

Holding

1. Yes, because the taxpayers failed to show they received the notice after the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

statute of limitations expired, thus not meeting their burden of proof.

Court’s Reasoning

The court emphasized that the statute of limitations is a defense in bar, not a jurisdictional issue. It cited prior cases to establish that taxpayers must make a prima facie case by proving the filing of the statutory return and the expiration of the statutory period. The court noted that if taxpayers claim they did not receive the notice before the limitations period expired, the Commissioner must then show the period was suspended. However, in this case, the Deaktors did not allege or prove receipt after September 15, 1971, despite conceding that receipt on or before this date would suspend the limitations period. The court quoted E. J. Lorie, stating, “the petitioner ‘must make a prima facie case, which ordinarily means proof of the filing of the statutory return and the expiration of the statutory period; whereupon the respondent must go forward with countervailing proof. ‘” Since the Deaktors failed to meet this burden, the court did not need to decide the notice’s validity at the time of mailing.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for taxpayers and practitioners in tax litigation. It reinforces that taxpayers bear the initial burden of proving the timing of receipt when challenging a notice of deficiency based on the statute of limitations. Practitioners must ensure clients can provide evidence of when they received a notice, especially if sent to an incorrect address. This case may influence future tax disputes by emphasizing the need for precise documentation of receipt dates. It also underscores the importance of the Commissioner’s responsibility to use correct addresses for notices, as failure to do so can complicate legal proceedings. Subsequent cases, such as those involving similar issues of notice receipt and limitations, will likely reference Deaktor to establish the burden of proof on taxpayers.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.