Dougherty v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 727 (1975)

A tax election under IRC § 962 cannot be revoked or conditionally withdrawn after litigation has concluded based on hindsight regarding the tax outcome.

Summary

In Dougherty v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that a taxpayer's election under IRC § 962 to be taxed at corporate rates on certain foreign income could not be revoked or conditionally withdrawn after the litigation had concluded, even if the election proved disadvantageous due to the court's findings on the amount of taxable income. The taxpayer had made the election expecting a higher taxable income, but after the court determined a lower amount, the taxpayer sought to withdraw the election. The court denied this motion, emphasizing the irrevocability of tax elections post-litigation and rejecting the taxpayer's reliance on hindsight and potential future appeals.

Facts

Albert L. Dougherty made an election under IRC § 962 to be taxed at corporate rates on income from investments in United States property by Liberia for the year 1963. The election was made on April 15, 1968, and was stipulated by the parties. The Tax Court initially held that the election was effective and that the amount of income includable under § 951(a) was $51,201. 92, significantly less than the $531,027. 92 claimed by the Commissioner. Following this decision, Dougherty sought to withdraw the § 962 election, arguing that it was disadvantageous given the lower taxable income determined by the court.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially ruled on the substantive issues of Dougherty's case, holding the § 962 election effective and determining the includable income. After failing to agree on a stipulated decision, the Commissioner filed a computation showing Dougherty's tax liability with the election in place. Dougherty then moved to withdraw the election, leading to the supplemental opinion where the Tax Court denied the motion to withdraw.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a taxpayer can withdraw or conditionally withdraw an election under IRC § 962 after the conclusion of litigation based on the tax outcome being less favorable than anticipated.

Holding

1. No, because IRC § 962(b) explicitly states that such an election may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary, and no such consent was sought

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

or given. Additionally, the court rejected the taxpayer's attempt to use hindsight to alter the election after litigation.

Court's Reasoning

The court's decision was grounded in the statutory language of IRC § 962(b), which prohibits revocation of the election without the Secretary's consent. The court distinguished prior cases cited by the taxpayer, such as W. K. Buckley, Inc. v. Commissioner, noting that those involved unconditional elections made before litigation, not conditional withdrawals post-litigation. The court emphasized that allowing such withdrawals based on hindsight would undermine the finality of tax elections and the stability of tax law. The court also rejected the taxpayer's reliance on the doctrine of mistake of fact, as Dougherty was aware of all material facts when making the election. The court quoted, "It seems to us sufficient for the taxpayer to indicate its election when it appears that a tax is due and when, therefore, an election first has significance," but clarified this did not apply to post-litigation conditional withdrawals.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of careful consideration when making tax elections, as they cannot be easily revoked or modified based on the outcomes of litigation. Taxpayers must be aware that elections are binding and should be made with full knowledge of the facts and potential tax consequences. Legal practitioners should advise clients to thoroughly evaluate the potential outcomes before making such elections. The case also impacts how tax professionals approach planning for clients with foreign income, emphasizing the need for strategic foresight rather than relying on post-litigation adjustments. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the principle that tax elections are generally irrevocable without specific statutory or regulatory permission.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.