Condo v. Commissioner, 69 T. C. 149, 1977 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 29 (T. C. 1977)

A corporation suspended under state law for failure to pay taxes lacks the capacity to litigate in the U. S. Tax Court.

Summary

In Condo v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed whether a California corporation, A. B. Condo Corp. , could litigate a tax deficiency notice despite its suspension under California law for nonpayment of franchise taxes. The court held that under Tax Court Rule 60(c), the corporation lacked the capacity to litigate because California law prohibited suspended corporations from prosecuting or defending any action. This decision underscores the necessity of maintaining corporate status to engage in legal proceedings, impacting how similar cases involving suspended corporations should be approached in the future.

Facts

The A. B. Condo Corp. , organized under California law, had its corporate rights, powers, and privileges suspended on December 15, 1969, due to failure to pay state franchise taxes. On April 26, 1976, the IRS sent a deficiency notice to the corporation. Armen B. Condo, the corporation's president and sole shareholder, filed a petition to the Tax Court to challenge the deficiency, mistakenly believing he was the corporation due to its dormant status.

Procedural History

The IRS moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that the suspended corporation lacked the capacity to litigate. The Tax Court granted the motion, ruling that the corporation could not engage in litigation under the applicable California statutes and Tax Court Rule 60(c).

Issue(s)

1. Whether a corporation suspended under California law for failure to pay franchise taxes has the capacity to litigate its tax liability in the U. S. Tax Court?

Holding

1. No, because under Tax Court Rule 60(c), the capacity of a corporation to litigate is determined by the law under which it was organized, and California law prohibits suspended corporations from prosecuting or defending any action.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Tax Court Rule 60(c), which dictates that a corporation's capacity

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to litigate is governed by the law of the state under which it was organized. California Revenue & Taxation Code sections 23301 et seq. suspend the corporate rights of delinquent taxpayers, rendering them incapable of suing or defending against suits. The court cited precedent from both state and federal courts, including Mather Construction Co. v. United States, which upheld this principle. The court rejected the notion that the corporation could defend against the deficiency notice, as California law explicitly denies suspended corporations the right to defend actions. The court noted that while the corporation could not litigate, Armen Condo could still be pursued individually as a transferee under IRC section 6901.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that corporations must maintain their status to engage in legal proceedings, particularly in tax disputes. Practitioners should advise clients to ensure compliance with state tax obligations to avoid losing litigation capacity. The ruling may influence how suspended corporations are treated in other federal courts, as it aligns with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b). Businesses should be aware of the severe consequences of corporate suspension, which can extend beyond state courts to affect federal tax litigation. Subsequent cases have consistently applied this principle, reinforcing the need for corporations to remain in good standing with state authorities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.