O’Brien v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 543 (1974)

A notice of deficiency must be sent to a taxpayer’s last known address or an address reasonably believed to be where the taxpayer would want to receive it.

Summary

In O’Brien v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that a notice of deficiency sent to an incarcerated taxpayer was invalid because it was not mailed to his last known address or any address he would reasonably expect to receive it. Patrick O’Brien, imprisoned at the time, did not receive the notice until over a year after it was sent to an attorney and a bail bondsman, neither of whom represented him. The court held that the IRS failed to make a reasonable effort to deliver the notice to O’Brien’s actual location, thus the notice was insufficient to confer jurisdiction upon the Tax Court.

Facts

Patrick O’Brien was arrested in Los Angeles on March 18, 1969, and interviewed by IRS revenue officers the next day. They determined he had unreported income from burglary in 1967. O’Brien was released and rearrested, remaining in custody since April 21, 1969. The IRS mailed two notices of deficiency on May 7, 1969, to an attorney for a co-defendant and a bail bondsman, neither of whom O’Brien had authorized to receive his mail. O’Brien did not receive the notices until June 1970, over a year later, while still incarcerated.

Procedural History

O’Brien filed a petition for redetermination in the U. S. Tax Court on September 13, 1971. The Tax Court initially dismissed the petition for lack of jurisdiction due to untimely filing. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals vacated this dismissal and remanded for reconsideration in light of Robinson v. Hanrahan (1972). After further proceedings, the Tax Court found the notice of deficiency invalid and dismissed the case for lack of jurisdiction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a notice of deficiency mailed to an incarcerated taxpayer at addresses not his own, and not received until over a year later, is valid under the Internal Revenue Code and the due process clause of the U. S. Constitution?

Holding

1. No, because the IRS did not mail the notice to O’Brien’s last known address or an address where he could reasonably be expected to receive it, and thus failed to comply with the statutory requirements of IRC § 6212(b)(1).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied IRC § 6212(b)(1), which requires notices of deficiency to be mailed to a taxpayer’s last known address. Since O’Brien had not filed a return for 1967, and the IRS had no prior address on file, the court focused on whether the IRS took adequate steps to determine an address where O’Brien would want to receive mail. The court found that mailing notices to an unrelated attorney and a bail bondsman, without any evidence that O’Brien authorized these recipients, did not meet the statutory requirement. The court referenced the principles in Robinson v. Hanrahan and Daniel Lifter, emphasizing that the notice must be reasonably calculated to apprise the taxpayer of the deficiency determination in time to file a timely petition. The court concluded that the IRS’s efforts were insufficient, and thus the notice was invalid and did not confer jurisdiction on the Tax Court.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of the IRS using due diligence to ensure notices of deficiency reach taxpayers, especially when their last known address is unknown. Practitioners should advise clients to keep the IRS informed of address changes to avoid similar issues. The ruling suggests that in cases where a taxpayer’s address is uncertain, the IRS must make a reasonable effort to locate the taxpayer or use an address where the taxpayer would likely receive the notice. This case has been cited in later decisions as a benchmark for the IRS’s obligations in serving notices of deficiency, emphasizing that failure to comply with these standards can result in the invalidation of the notice and any related tax assessments.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.