Axe v. Commissioner, 58 T. C. 256 (1972)

A petition to the U. S. Tax Court must be correctly addressed and received within the statutory 90-day period to establish jurisdiction.

Summary

In Axe v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that it lacked jurisdiction over a petition filed by Baker L. and Helen D. Axe because it was not timely filed. The petition was sent to the Internal Revenue Service instead of the Tax Court within the 90-day period following the notice of deficiency. Despite being postmarked within the 90 days, the misaddressed petition did not satisfy the filing requirements of sections 6213(a) and 7502(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, resulting in the dismissal of the case for lack of jurisdiction. The decision underscores the strict adherence to filing deadlines and proper addressing in tax litigation.

Facts

On September 28, 1971, the Commissioner mailed a statutory notice of deficiency to Baker L. and Helen D. Axe for their 1968 and 1969 federal income taxes. On December 20, 1971, the Axes, through their accountant, prepared an informal petition on the explanation of adjustments page attached to the notice. This was sent by first-class mail in an envelope addressed to the "Internal Revenue Service, Attention: Tax Court of United States, 200 No. Los Angeles, Calif. " The petition was received by the IRS on December 28, 1971, and forwarded to the Tax Court on December 29, 1971, where it was received on January 3, 1972, 97 days after the notice of deficiency was mailed.

Procedural History

The Commissioner filed a motion to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction on February 28, 1972, arguing that the petition was not filed within the time prescribed by sections 6213(a) and 7502(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Axes objected to this motion on April 4, 1972. A hearing was held on April 17, 1972, after which the Tax Court granted the Commissioner's motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction over a petition that was misaddressed to the Internal Revenue Service and received by the Tax Court after the 90-day period prescribed by section 6213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the petition was not timely filed "with the Tax Court" within the period prescribed by sections 6213(a) and 7502(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as it was misaddressed and not received by the Tax Court within 90 days.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court’s decision was based on the strict interpretation of sections 6213(a) and 7502(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. Section 6213(a) requires a petition to be filed with the Tax Court within 90 days after the mailing of the statutory notice of deficiency. The court emphasized that this requirement is jurisdictional, and failure to meet it deprives the court of jurisdiction. The court referenced the case of Lurkins, where a similar issue arose, and the petition was deemed untimely because it was not properly addressed. The court noted that section 7502(a) provides an exception to the 90-day rule if the document is properly addressed and postmarked within the period, but this exception did not apply as the Axes’ petition was misaddressed to the IRS. The court concluded that it could not extend the statutory period regardless of the equities of the case, and the IRS was under no obligation to forward the petition to the Tax Court.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the importance of correctly addressing and timely filing petitions with the Tax Court. Practitioners must ensure that all filings are directed to the proper office to avoid jurisdictional issues. The ruling highlights that the IRS is not obligated to forward misaddressed petitions, and taxpayers must adhere strictly to the statutory deadlines. The case also indicates that taxpayers have an alternative remedy by paying the deficiency and filing a suit for refund in the U. S. District Court if they miss the Tax Court deadline. This case has been cited in subsequent rulings to emphasize the strict enforcement of filing deadlines and proper addressing in tax litigation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.