Estate of Floyd Falese, Deceased, Jacqueline Falese, Executor, and Jacqueline Falese, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 58 T. C. 895 (1972)

When a new matter is introduced at trial, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent in tax cases.

Summary

In Estate of Falese v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether supervisory fees were taxable to the decedent Floyd Falese as either received income or as part of his distributive share of partnership income. The court held that the petitioners successfully demonstrated that Falese did not receive the fees. Additionally, the court ruled that the IRS's new argument at trial—that the fees were part of Falese's distributive share—constituted a new matter, shifting the burden of proof to the IRS. The IRS failed to meet this burden, leading to the decision that the fees were not taxable to Falese.

Facts

Floyd Falese and Marvin E. Affeld were partners in an oil property development business. The partnership reported a deduction of $36,592. 70 for supervisory fees in 1964. The IRS issued a deficiency notice claiming that Falese received $18,296. 35 of these fees, which he did not report as income. Falese's financial records did not show receipt of these fees. At trial, the IRS argued that the fees should be included in Falese's income as part of his distributive share from the partnership, a position not clearly stated in the deficiency notice.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in Falese's income tax for the years 1960, 1963, and 1964. After Floyd Falese's death, Jacqueline Falese, as executor, continued the case. Most issues were settled, but the taxability of the supervisory fees remained. The Tax Court heard the case, and after a continuance for further examination of Falese's records, ruled on the matter.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Floyd Falese received $18,296. 35 in supervisory fees.
2. Whether the IRS's position at trial that the fees were part of Falese's distributive share constituted a new matter, shifting the burden of proof to the IRS.
3. If the burden shifted, whether the IRS met its burden of proving that the fees were part of Falese's distributive share.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioners demonstrated through Falese's financial records and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

testimony from his accountant that he did not receive the fees.
2. Yes, because the IRS's new position at trial was not clearly raised in the deficiency notice, and the evidence required to address this new position was different from what was initially required.
3. No, because the IRS failed to provide evidence that the fees were an unallowable deduction or that Falese was entitled to a share of the fees paid to his partner.

Court's Reasoning

The court emphasized the importance of the burden of proof in tax cases. It found that Falese's records were credible and sufficient to prove non-receipt of the supervisory fees. Regarding the IRS's new position at trial, the court determined that it constituted a new matter because the deficiency notice specifically referred to the fees as "received" income, not distributive share income. The court cited precedents where shifting the burden of proof to the IRS was appropriate when new matters were introduced at trial. The IRS's failure to provide evidence on the partnership agreement or the nature of the supervisory fees led the court to conclude that the IRS did not meet its burden of proof.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of clear deficiency notices and the potential consequences of introducing new matters at trial. Tax practitioners should be aware that if the IRS shifts its argument, it may bear the burden of proof on the new issue. This case also highlights the significance of maintaining thorough and accurate financial records, as they can be crucial in disproving IRS claims of unreported income. Subsequent cases have reinforced the principles established here, emphasizing the need for the IRS to clearly articulate its position in deficiency notices and to be prepared to substantiate new claims introduced at trial.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.