

Estate of Fred A. Etoll, Sr. , Deceased, Fred A. Etoll, Jr. , Executor, and Freda E. Etoll, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 79 T. C. 676 (1982)

The claim of right doctrine applies to income received from partnership receivables, requiring inclusion in gross income when received without restriction, even if later determined to belong to others.

Summary

In *Estate of Etoll v. Commissioner*, the Tax Court addressed whether the claim of right doctrine applied to partnership receivables collected by Fred A. Etoll, Sr. , after the partnership's dissolution. Etoll collected the receivables based on a 1960 partnership agreement but a state court later ruled he was entitled to only 40%. The Tax Court held that the full amount collected must be included in Etoll's 1973 gross income under the claim of right doctrine, as he received the funds without restriction. This decision underscores the application of the claim of right doctrine to partnership income and emphasizes the annual accounting principle in tax law.

Facts

Fred A. Etoll, Sr. , Leo J. Wagner, and Anthony V. Farina were partners in a public accounting firm that dissolved in 1973. Etoll collected \$64,783. 26 in accounts receivable based on a 1960 partnership agreement, which he believed entitled him to 100% of the receivables. He deposited these funds into accounts from which only he could withdraw or used them for personal expenses. Wagner and Farina sued Etoll, claiming entitlement to a portion of the receivables. In 1978, a New York State court ruled that Etoll was entitled to only 40% of the receivables, with Wagner and Farina each entitled to 30%.

Procedural History

Etoll included only a portion of the receivables in his 1973 tax return, excluding amounts for potential legal fees and a contingency for the lawsuit. The Commissioner determined a deficiency in Etoll's 1973 Federal income tax, asserting that the entire amount collected should be included in gross income. The case was submitted to the United States Tax Court, which ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the full amount of partnership accounts receivable collected by Fred A. Etoll, Sr. , in 1973 must be included in his gross income for that year under the claim of right doctrine.

Holding

1. Yes, because the funds were received under a claim of right and without

restriction as to their disposition, they must be included in Etoll's 1973 gross income, regardless of the subsequent state court decision regarding ownership.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the claim of right doctrine, which mandates that income received without restriction must be included in gross income for the year of receipt. The court rejected Etoll's argument that the doctrine did not apply to partnership income, stating that the general principle of including funds acquired under a claim of right and without restriction as income remains unchanged by partnership tax rules. The court cited *North American Oil v. Burnet* and other precedents to emphasize the finality of the annual accounting period in tax law. The court also noted that even if Wagner and Farina were taxable on their shares of the receivables, Etoll would still be taxed on the full amount he received. The court dismissed Etoll's attempt to exclude anticipated legal fees, affirming that a cash basis taxpayer can only deduct amounts actually paid in the tax year.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that the claim of right doctrine applies to partnership income, requiring taxpayers to report income from partnership receivables in the year received, even if later found to belong to other partners. Legal practitioners must advise clients to report such income on an annual basis, without waiting for the resolution of disputes over ownership. The ruling reinforces the importance of the annual accounting period in tax law, impacting how partnerships handle the dissolution process and the distribution of assets. Subsequent cases like *Healy v. Commissioner* have cited Etoll to uphold the application of the claim of right doctrine in similar contexts.