Mathes v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 642, 1975 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 181 (1975)

The tax surcharge under section 51(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, even when applied retroactively, is constitutional and not an ex post facto law.

Summary

In Mathes v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court upheld the constitutionality of the income tax surcharge imposed by section 51(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code. Donald and Patricia Mathes challenged the surcharge for the 1970 tax year as an unconstitutional ex post facto law, arguing it had retroactive effect. The court, relying on precedent, ruled that the ex post facto clause applies only to criminal laws, not to tax legislation, and affirmed Congress's authority to enact retroactive tax laws. This decision reinforced the legal principle that tax surcharges, even when applied retroactively, are within Congress's legislative power.

Facts

Donald and Patricia Mathes, residents of Dallas, Texas, filed their joint Federal income tax return for 1970, denying liability for the income tax surcharge under section 51(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code. They claimed the surcharge was unconstitutional as an ex post facto law due to its retroactive application. The Matheses also sought a credit for surcharges paid in 1968 and 1969. The Commissioner determined the Matheses were liable for the 1970 surcharge and disallowed the credit claim, as no estimated tax payments or overpayments were applicable to 1970.

Procedural History

The Matheses filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the Commissioner's determination. The Tax Court, after considering the fully stipulated facts, issued its opinion on March 17, 1975, affirming the Commissioner's position and holding the tax surcharge constitutional.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the tax surcharge imposed under section 51(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, applied to the 1970 tax year, is an unconstitutional ex post facto law due to its retroactive effect.

Holding

1. No, because the tax surcharge under section 51(a)(1)(A) is not an ex post facto law, as the constitutional prohibition against ex post facto laws applies only to criminal legislation, not to tax laws, and Congress has the authority to enact retroactive tax legislation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied on established legal principles to determine that the ex post facto clause of the U. S. Constitution is limited to criminal laws, as stated in Johannessen v. United States, 225 U. S. 227 (1912). The court emphasized that “the prohibition of article I, section 9, of the Constitution against ex post facto laws is confined in operation solely to laws respecting criminal punishment, and has no application to retrospective legislation of any other description. ” This reasoning directly countered the Matheses’ argument that the tax surcharge was an unconstitutional ex post facto law. The court also cited David O. Rose, 55 T. C. 28 (1970), to affirm Congress’s authority to enact retroactive tax legislation. No dissenting or concurring opinions were noted in the decision.

Practical Implications

This ruling clarifies that income tax surcharges, even when applied retroactively, are constitutional and do not violate the ex post facto clause. Attorneys should be aware that taxpayers cannot challenge such surcharges on this ground. This decision reinforces Congress’s broad authority to enact tax legislation with retroactive effect, influencing how tax practitioners advise clients on potential tax liabilities from new or amended tax laws. The ruling may affect how businesses and individuals plan their taxes, knowing that Congress can impose retroactive taxes. Subsequent cases involving retroactive tax legislation typically cite Mathes v. Commissioner to support the constitutionality of such laws.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.