Price v. Commissioner, 76 T. C. 389 (1981)

An envelope with an incorrect zip code but correct street address is considered properly addressed for timely filing under Section 7502.

Summary

In Price v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court held that an envelope containing a petition for redetermination of a tax deficiency, which had the correct street address but an incorrect zip code, was properly addressed under Section 7502 of the Internal Revenue Code. The petition was mailed within the 90-day statutory period but returned due to the zip code error and subsequently remailed. The court reasoned that a reasonable interpretation of 'properly addressed' should apply, emphasizing that zip codes are not mandatory for mail delivery. This ruling impacts how attorneys should handle timely filing of petitions, particularly when zip code errors occur, and underscores the need to balance strict regulatory interpretations with fairness to taxpayers.

Facts

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency to the Prices on April 30, 1980. The Prices' counsel mailed a petition to the U. S. Tax Court on July 28, 1980, within the 90-day period prescribed by Section 6213(a). The petition was initially mailed in an envelope addressed to the Tax Court with the correct street address but an incorrect zip code (20044 instead of 20217). The U. S. Postal Service returned the envelope as undeliverable. The counsel then remailed the unopened original envelope in a new envelope with the correct address and zip code, using a private postage meter dated July 28, 1980. The Tax Court received the petition on August 18, 1980, 110 days after the deficiency notice was mailed.

Procedural History

The Commissioner moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that the petition was not timely filed due to the incorrect zip code on the initial mailing. The case was assigned to a Special Trial Judge for a hearing on the motion. After oral arguments, the Tax Court adopted the Special Trial Judge's opinion and denied the Commissioner's motion to dismiss.

Issue(s)

1. Whether an envelope containing a petition for redetermination of a tax deficiency, which has the correct street address but an incorrect zip code, is considered "properly addressed" under Section 7502 of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. Yes, because the court held that the term "properly addressed" should be

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

reasonably interpreted, and an incorrect zip code does not render an otherwise correct address improper, particularly when the delay in delivery is attributable to the Postal Service.

Court's Reasoning

The court's decision hinged on a reasonable interpretation of the term "properly addressed" in Section 7502. It noted that the U. S. Postal Service's Domestic Mail Manual does not require a zip code for delivery, emphasizing that only the name, street, and number are necessary. The court distinguished this case from prior rulings, such as Estate of Cerrito v. Commissioner, where the address lacked a correct location, and Smetanka v. Commissioner, where the zip code indicated a different region. The court cited Minuto v. Commissioner and Clark v. Commissioner, where envelopes with incorrect zip codes were deemed properly addressed. The court emphasized the purpose of Section 7502, which is to mitigate hardships caused by postal delays, and concluded that a delay due to an incorrect zip code should be attributed to the Postal Service, not the sender.

Practical Implications

The Price decision impacts how attorneys handle the filing of petitions with the Tax Court, particularly when zip code errors occur. It establishes that a petition is considered timely filed if the envelope contains the correct street address, even if the zip code is incorrect. This ruling encourages a more lenient interpretation of filing requirements, promoting fairness to taxpayers. Attorneys should ensure that the street address is correct when filing petitions and can rely on this case to argue against dismissal for lack of jurisdiction due to zip code errors. The decision also underscores the importance of the Postal Service's role in timely delivery, suggesting that future cases may focus on whether delays are attributable to postal errors rather than the sender's actions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.