Randolph v. Commissioner, 74 T. C. 284 (1980)

Religious beliefs opposing participation in Social Security do not exempt individuals from self-employment tax if their sect does not have established tenets against such participation.

Summary

Ronald and Stella Randolph, members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church, argued that their religious beliefs precluded them from paying self-employment taxes due to their opposition to Social Security. The U. S. Tax Court held that they were liable for the taxes because their church did not have established tenets against Social Security participation. The court rejected their constitutional challenges, finding no violation of the First or Fifth Amendments. Additionally, the court found Stella was not collaterally estopped by a prior decision against Ronald. The Randolphs were also denied an additional mileage deduction for the 1974 tax year.

Facts

Ronald and Stella Randolph were active members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church and believed participation in the Social Security program violated their religious beliefs. However, the General Conference of the Seventh Day Adventist Church had taken no official position on Social Security participation. Ronald had previously been denied an exemption from self-employment tax and lost a case challenging this denial. The Randolphs did not pay self-employment tax on their income for the tax years 1974, 1975, and 1976, leading to the IRS issuing a notice of deficiency.

Procedural History

The Randolphs filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's determination of deficiency for the years 1974-1976. The IRS argued that Ronald was collaterally estopped by a prior Tax Court decision against him. The court rejected this argument for Stella, as she was not a party to the prior case, and proceeded to consider the merits of the case for both petitioners.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Randolphs are liable for self-employment tax under sections 1401 and 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether the Randolphs are entitled to a deduction for automobile expenses in excess of those allowed by the IRS for the 1974 taxable year.

Holding

1. Yes, because the Randolphs' religious sect does not have established tenets opposing Social Security participation, and the self-employment tax does not violate

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

their constitutional rights.
2. No, because the Randolphs failed to provide evidence supporting a deduction for mileage beyond what was allowed by the IRS.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied section 1402(h) of the Internal Revenue Code, which requires a religious sect to have established tenets opposing public insurance and to provide for its dependent members to qualify for an exemption from self-employment tax. The court found that the Seventh Day Adventist Church did not meet these requirements, despite the Randolphs’ individual beliefs. The court rejected the Randolphs’ constitutional arguments, citing precedent that the tax did not violate the First or Fifth Amendments. The court emphasized that the tax is a valid exercise of Congress’s power and does not result in unconstitutional discrimination or taking. Regarding the mileage deduction, the court noted that the Randolphs did not provide evidence to support their claim and that commuting expenses are not deductible.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that individual religious beliefs alone are insufficient to exempt someone from self-employment tax if their sect does not have established tenets against Social Security participation. Legal practitioners should advise clients that exemptions under section 1402(h) require adherence to specific statutory criteria, not just personal beliefs. This case also reinforces that the IRS is not estopped by prior representations of its agents regarding deductions. Practitioners should be cautious about relying on informal IRS statements when advising clients on deductions. Subsequent cases have followed this ruling, maintaining the strict application of section 1402(h) criteria.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.