Thompson v. Commissioner, 69 T. C. 760 (1978)

A document is considered timely filed if mailed on or before the due date, even without a postmark, when sufficient evidence shows it would have been timely postmarked.

Summary

In Thompson v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether a small business corporation election was timely filed under Section 1372(c)(1). Robert Hicks Thompson sought to deduct a net operating loss from his wholly owned corporation, Transcontinental Aviation, Ltd. , Inc. The court found that despite the absence of a postmark on the election form, sufficient evidence indicated it was mailed on the last day of the filing period, December 31, 1969. Additionally, the court held the election valid for the intended tax year, despite an incorrect effective date on the form, based on precedent from Ralph L. Brutsche.

Facts

Robert Hicks Thompson owned all the stock of Transcontinental Aviation, Ltd. , Inc. , which adopted a taxable year ending November 30. On December 31, 1969, Thompson signed Form 2553 to elect small business corporation status for Transcontinental's taxable year beginning December 1, 1969. The form was erroneously dated January 1, 1969, but was placed in a properly addressed envelope and mailed on December 31, 1969. The Internal Revenue Service received the form on January 6, 1970, without the envelope, and thus no postmark was available. Transcontinental reported a net loss of $58,818. 75 for the year ending November 30, 1970, which Thompson attempted to deduct on his personal tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency of $31,314. 94 in Thompson's 1970 federal income tax, disallowing the deduction of the corporation's net operating loss on the grounds that the small business corporation election was not valid. The Tax Court was tasked with determining whether the election was timely filed and valid for the intended tax year.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Form 2553 was timely filed under Section 7502(a)(1) despite the absence of a postmark?
2. Whether the Form 2553 constituted a valid election for Transcontinental's taxable year beginning December 1, 1969, despite the incorrect effective date stated on the form?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the court found sufficient evidence that the form was mailed on December 31, 1969, and would have been timely postmarked if the envelope had been retained.
2. Yes, because the election, filed within the first month of the taxable year, was valid for that year, following the precedent set in Ralph L. Brutsche.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 7502(a)(1), which deems a document timely filed if mailed on or before the due date. Despite the lack of a postmark, the court relied on testimony that the form was mailed on December 31, 1969, before the deadline for filing the election. The court cited Fred Sylvan, where it was held that a postmark is not essential if evidence convincingly shows the document would have been timely postmarked. The court also addressed the incorrect effective date on the form, citing Ralph L. Brutsche, where an election filed within the required period was held valid despite an incorrect effective date. The court concluded that the election was valid for the tax year beginning December 1, 1969, allowing Thompson to deduct the net operating loss.

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the importance of timely mailing for tax filings and the flexibility in interpreting election forms. Practitioners should ensure documentation of mailing dates, particularly when postmarks are unavailable. The ruling clarifies that a small business corporation election is valid if filed within the statutory period, even with clerical errors in the effective date. This case influences how similar tax elections are analyzed, stressing the importance of intent and procedural compliance over strict formalities. It also impacts business planning by affirming the ability to pass through losses to shareholders when elections are timely, even if imperfectly executed.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.