Cupp v. Commissioner, 65 T. C. 68 (1975)

A document must contain sufficient data for the IRS to compute and assess tax liability and must be signed under penalties of perjury to be considered a valid tax return.

Summary

Edward A. Cupp, a chiropractor, submitted incomplete tax forms for 1969-1971, claiming his Fifth Amendment rights and arguing that only gold and silver are legal tender. The Tax Court ruled that these documents were not valid returns due to missing financial data and lack of a perjury declaration. The court rejected Cupp's constitutional challenges, upholding the IRS's deficiency calculations based on bank records and affirming the additions to tax for failure to file and negligence.

Facts

Edward A. Cupp, a chiropractor, submitted incomplete tax forms for 1969, 1970, and 1971. For 1969, he filed a blank Form 1040 with the perjury clause deleted and an attached letter citing constitutional objections. For 1970 and 1971, he similarly submitted forms without financial data, claiming only minimal income in silver coins. Cupp refused to provide his books and records to the IRS, leading the agency to use bank records to determine his income. Cupp challenged the IRS's methods and the constitutionality of the income tax.

Procedural History

Cupp contested the IRS's deficiency notices in the U. S. Tax Court. The IRS had denied his extension request for 1969 and rejected his subsequent filings as non-returns. After Cupp refused to provide his records, the IRS used third-party information to calculate his tax liability. The Tax Court heard the case and issued its opinion on October 14, 1975.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the documents submitted by Cupp for 1969, 1970, and 1971 constituted valid Federal income tax returns.
2. Whether Cupp's failure to file valid returns was due to reasonable cause under the Fifth Amendment.
3. Whether the IRS's method of determining Cupp's taxable income violated his constitutional rights.
4. Whether the Federal income tax is unconstitutional for taxing amounts received in forms other than gold and silver coins.
5. Whether Cupp's Sixth Amendment rights were violated by the court's refusal to allow non-attorney representation.
6. Whether Cupp was entitled to a jury trial and whether the judge's refusal to recuse herself was prejudicial.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the documents lacked sufficient data to compute tax liability and were not signed under penalties of perjury.
2. No, because the Fifth Amendment does not excuse a taxpayer from filing a return; Cupp's refusal was willful.
3. No, because the IRS's use of third-party records was lawful and did not violate Cupp's Fourth or Fifth Amendment rights.
4. No, because the argument that only gold and silver are legal tender is frivolous and the income tax is constitutional.
5. No, because the Sixth Amendment applies to criminal cases, not civil tax proceedings, and Cupp was given full opportunity to represent himself.
6. No, because Cupp was not entitled to a jury trial in Tax Court, and the judge's refusal to recuse herself was not prejudicial.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that a valid return must contain sufficient data for the IRS to compute tax liability and must be signed under penalties of perjury. Cupp's documents failed on both counts. The court rejected Cupp's Fifth Amendment claim, citing precedent that the amendment does not excuse filing a tax return. The court upheld the IRS's use of third-party records as a lawful method of determining income when a taxpayer refuses to provide their own records. The court dismissed Cupp's argument that only gold and silver are legal tender as frivolous, affirming the constitutionality of the income tax. Regarding representation, the court noted that the Sixth Amendment applies to criminal cases, not civil tax disputes, and Cupp had ample opportunity to represent himself. Finally, the court clarified that Tax Court proceedings do not guarantee a jury trial, and the judge's refusal to recuse herself was not prejudicial, especially given Cupp's tactic of naming all Tax Court judges in separate lawsuits.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the necessity for taxpayers to file complete and properly sworn tax returns, emphasizing that constitutional objections do not excuse non-compliance. Practitioners should advise clients that the IRS may use third-party records to determine income when taxpayers refuse to provide their own. The ruling also clarifies that the Tax Court is not bound by the Sixth Amendment or jury trial requirements, which is important for attorneys considering their strategy in tax disputes. Furthermore, this case illustrates the futility of challenging the income tax's constitutionality on the basis of legal tender arguments, guiding practitioners away from such frivolous claims. Subsequent cases have continued to uphold these principles, reinforcing the IRS's authority and the procedural rules of the Tax Court.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.