Weber v. Commissioner, 67 T. C. 858 (1977)

For cash basis taxpayers, sending certified checks that are not accepted or honored does not constitute payment for tax deduction purposes under section 461(f).

Summary

In Weber v. Commissioner, the taxpayers sought to deduct sewer charges paid by certified checks sent in 1972 but returned in 1973. The Tax Court held that these checks did not constitute payment for deduction purposes under section 461(f) because they were not accepted or honored by the recipients. The court emphasized that for cash basis taxpayers, payment must be completed to claim a deduction, and the mere sending of certified checks did not suffice. This decision underscores the importance of completed payment for cash basis taxpayers and the limitations of section 461(f) in contested liability scenarios.

Facts

Joseph and Kathryn Weber owned Sunny Acres Mobile Village and contested sewer service charges imposed by the Town of Niagara. In 1972, they sent certified checks to the Town and County for the sewer charges they admitted owing, totaling $39,850. These checks were sent during ongoing litigation challenging the charges. The checks were returned in 1973 without being accepted or presented to a bank. The Webers claimed these amounts as deductions on their 1972 tax return, but the IRS disallowed them, asserting that no payment occurred in 1972.

Procedural History

The Webers filed a petition with the Tax Court contesting the IRS's determination of a deficiency in their 1972 federal income tax. The IRS argued that the certified checks did not constitute payment under section 461(f) because they were not accepted or honored. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that the Webers were not entitled to a deduction for the sewer charges in 1972.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the sending of certified checks that were not accepted or honored by the recipients constitutes a "transfer" under section 461(f)(2) for cash basis taxpayers.
2. Whether the Webers are entitled to a deduction under section 461(f) for the taxable year 1972, given that the checks were not accepted or honored.

Holding

1. No, because the checks were not accepted or presented to a bank by the recipients, and thus did not constitute a transfer under section 461(f)(2).
2. No, because the Webers did not meet the fourth statutory condition of section 461(f)(4), as no payment occurred in 1972, and the contest over liability was not the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

only factor preventing a deduction.

Court’s Reasoning

The court analyzed the statutory language of section 461(f), focusing on the requirement of a “transfer” under subsection (f)(2) and the condition in subsection (f)(4) that a deduction would be allowed but for the contest over liability. The court found that the checks, although certified, did not constitute payment because they were not accepted or honored. The court relied on established case law stating that checks are conditional payments that become absolute only when honored by a bank. The court also noted that the Webers’ failure to pay the sewer charges in 1972 was an additional factor preventing a deduction, beyond the contest over liability. The court’s decision was influenced by the policy that cash basis taxpayers must have completed payment to claim a deduction.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for cash basis taxpayers, the mere sending of certified checks does not suffice as payment for tax deduction purposes if they are not accepted or honored. Legal practitioners should advise clients that under section 461(f), all statutory conditions must be met, including actual payment, to claim deductions for contested liabilities. This ruling affects how taxpayers handle payments during disputes with taxing authorities and emphasizes the importance of ensuring payments are completed and accepted to secure deductions. Subsequent cases may reference Weber when addressing the deductibility of payments in contested liability situations, particularly for cash basis taxpayers.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.