Estate of Mary Mason, Deceased, Herbert L. Harris, Administrator, and Robert Mason, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 64 T.C. 651 (1975)

When a taxpayer fails to maintain adequate records of income, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue's determination of income using the bank deposit method is presumed correct, and the burden of proof shifts to the taxpayer to demonstrate the determination is inaccurate.

Summary

The Estate of Mason case addresses the evidentiary burden in tax disputes when taxpayers fail to maintain adequate income records. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's use of the bank deposit method to reconstruct the Masons' income, as their bank deposits significantly exceeded their reported income and they lacked adequate records. The court ruled that the initial burden of proof rested with the Masons to disprove the Commissioner's determination. While the Commissioner conceded some deposits were non-income after trial testimony, this concession did not shift the overall burden of proof back to the Commissioner. The court ultimately found that the Masons failed to meet their burden of proving the Commissioner's assessment incorrect, except for the conceded amounts, and sustained penalties for negligence.

Facts

Robert and Mary Mason reported modest investment and rental income for 1966 and 1967. However, they maintained three bank accounts with deposits far exceeding their reported income: $157,496.48 in 1966 and $623,617.12 in 1967. The Masons kept no formal books or records of their income. During an IRS investigation, Mr. Mason initially gave an implausible explanation about "floating checks" to avoid interest. He later claimed the deposits were from check-cashing services and loans, activities not reflected in their tax returns. Mr. Mason destroyed his canceled checks and deposit receipts and initially refused to provide further information to the IRS agent.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in the Masons' federal income tax for 1966 and 1967, using the bank deposit method to reconstruct their income. The Masons petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the deficiencies. At trial, Mr. Mason offered a new explanation for the deposits, claiming they were largely non-income items from check cashing and loan activities. The Commissioner conceded some deposits were non-income based on this new testimony. The Tax Court then had to determine the remaining unreported income and penalties for negligence.

Issue(s)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Whether the burden of proving the petitioners' gross income for 1966 and 1967 is on the Commissioner.

2. What income the petitioners actually received in 1966 and 1967.

3. Whether any part of the underpayment of the petitioners' tax for 1966 and 1967 was due to negligence or intentional disregard of rules and regulations.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioners failed to maintain adequate records, the Commissioner's use of the bank deposit method was reasonable, and the burden of proof rested on the petitioners to show the determination was incorrect.

2. The petitioners had unreported income of $51,422.09 in 1966 and $84,954.37 in 1967, after accounting for conceded non-income deposits and reported income.

3. Yes, because the petitioners presented no evidence or argument to refute the negligence penalty, and their failure to keep adequate records and accurately report income constituted negligence.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the bank deposit method is a long-accepted and valid approach for income reconstruction when taxpayers fail to keep adequate records. The court stated, "Though not conclusive, bank deposits are prima facie evidence of income." Because the Masons lacked records and their deposits far exceeded reported income, the Commissioner's resort to this method was not arbitrary. The burden of proof, therefore, rested with the Masons to demonstrate inaccuracies in the Commissioner's assessment.

The court distinguished this case from situations where the Commissioner's methodology is inherently arbitrary from the outset. Here, the Masons' lack of cooperation and records justified the Commissioner's initial determination. While the Commissioner conceded some deposits were non-income based on trial testimony, this concession, according to the court, "merely relieved the petitioner of a portion of his burden of proof; it did not affect the petitioner's burden as to those deposits not conceded."

Regarding the negligence penalty, the court emphasized the Masons' failure to present any evidence or argument against it, thus failing to meet their burden of proof to overturn the Commissioner's determination. The court concluded that the underpayment was due to negligence or intentional disregard of rules and regulations.

Practical Implications

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Estate of Mason v. Commissioner reinforces the importance of taxpayers maintaining adequate records of income. It establishes that when records are insufficient, the IRS can use the bank deposit method to reconstruct income, and this method is presumptively valid. Taxpayers in such situations bear the burden of proving the IRS's determination incorrect. This case highlights that:

1. Taxpayers must keep sufficient records to substantiate their income and deductions.
2. The bank deposit method is a powerful tool for the IRS in cases of inadequate records.
3. Concessions by the IRS during litigation do not automatically shift the overall burden of proof back to the agency.
4. Failure to challenge penalties specifically will likely result in their being upheld.

This case is frequently cited in tax disputes involving unreported income and the bank deposit method, serving as a reminder of the evidentiary burdens taxpayers face when their financial records are lacking.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.