Roberts v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 834 (1974)

The burden of proving claimed deductions lies with the taxpayer, and a tax surcharge is considered a tax on income, not requiring apportionment.

Summary

E. Jan Roberts challenged the IRS's disallowance of his 1969 tax deductions for casualty loss and business expenses, and sought a refund of a tax surcharge. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's decision, ruling that Roberts failed to provide evidence for his deductions and that the tax surcharge was constitutional. The court emphasized that the burden of proof for deductions rests with the taxpayer, and the surcharge was an income tax not requiring apportionment among states.

Facts

E. Jan Roberts, a contracts consultant and public relations worker in Los Angeles, claimed deductions on his 1969 tax return for employee business expenses and a casualty loss. The IRS audited his return and requested substantiation for these deductions, which Roberts refused to provide, citing his Fifth Amendment rights. The IRS disallowed the deductions and assessed a deficiency. Roberts also sought a refund of a tax surcharge he paid under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

Roberts filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's disallowance of his deductions and the tax surcharge. The Tax Court heard the case and issued a decision upholding the IRS's determinations.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the IRS was arbitrary and unreasonable in disallowing Roberts's deductions for casualty loss and employee business expenses?
2. Whether Roberts has the right to have his return presumed correct because it was signed under penalties of perjury?
3. Whether requiring Roberts to bear the burden of proving his claimed deductions violates his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination?
4. Whether Roberts sustained his burden of proving his claimed deductions?
5. Whether the tax surcharge imposed by section 51 is a tax on income?

Holding

1. No, because Roberts refused to substantiate his deductions, the IRS's determination was not arbitrary or unreasonable.
2. No, because federal law, not state law, determines presumptions in interpreting the Internal Revenue Code, and a tax return is not presumed correct.
3. No, because the possibility of criminal prosecution was remote, and the Fifth

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Amendment does not shift the burden of proof to the IRS.
4. No, because Roberts's only evidence was his unsubstantiated testimony that his return was correct.
5. Yes, because the tax surcharge is an additional tax on income and does not need to be apportioned among the states.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the legal rule that the burden of proving deductions lies with the taxpayer. It reasoned that since Roberts refused to provide evidence to substantiate his deductions, the IRS's disallowance was justified. The court rejected Roberts's arguments that the IRS's actions were arbitrary or that his return should be presumed correct under California law, citing that federal law governs tax presumptions. On the Fifth Amendment issue, the court found no violation because the possibility of criminal prosecution was remote. The court also clarified that the tax surcharge under section 51 was an income tax, not a direct tax requiring apportionment, based on the statutory language and Congressional intent. Key policy considerations included maintaining the integrity of the tax system by requiring taxpayers to substantiate deductions and ensuring the constitutionality of tax surcharges.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces that taxpayers must substantiate their deductions, emphasizing the importance of record-keeping and compliance in tax audits. Practitioners should advise clients to maintain thorough documentation to support their tax claims. The ruling also clarifies the constitutionality of tax surcharges, which may affect legislative strategies for future revenue collection. Subsequent cases, such as Pietsch v. President of United States, have addressed the constitutionality of tax surcharges on other grounds, but this decision remains authoritative on the issues of burden of proof and the nature of surcharges as income taxes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.