Arrighi v. Commissioner, 81 T. C. 42 (1983)

The IRS may use reasonable surveillance methods to reconstruct unreported income, even if those methods are not perfect, as long as they are designed to clearly reflect the taxpayer's income.

Summary

In Arrighi v. Commissioner, the Tax Court upheld the IRS's use of a surveillance project to reconstruct the unreported 'toke' income of casino dealers at Caesar's Palace. The IRS observed dealers' daily toke exchanges and calculated an average hourly rate, which was then applied to the dealers' work hours to determine their income. The court found the IRS's method reasonable despite minor inaccuracies, emphasizing the dealers' failure to maintain adequate records. The decision also affirmed negligence penalties for the dealers' lack of record-keeping. This case illustrates the broad latitude the IRS has in reconstructing income when taxpayers fail to report it accurately.

Facts

Petitioners were blackjack, roulette, and Big Wheel dealers at Caesar's Palace in Las Vegas, receiving 'tokes' (tips) from players. These tokes were pooled and counted daily. The IRS conducted a surveillance project from February 1976 to January 1977, observing 48 days of toke exchanges at the casino's cashier cage. The agents recorded the chip counts and calculated an average daily toke rate of $63. 45, which was adjusted to an hourly rate of $7. 93. The petitioners did not maintain records of their toke income, instead reporting arbitrary amounts on their tax returns. The IRS used the surveillance data to reconstruct the petitioners' income for the years 1976-79 and assessed deficiencies and negligence penalties.

Procedural History

The petitioners challenged the IRS's determinations in the U. S. Tax Court. The court consolidated 112 cases involving similar issues. After reviewing the evidence and arguments, the Tax Court sustained the IRS's reconstruction of the petitioners' toke income and upheld the negligence penalties.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioners understated their toke income by the amounts determined by the IRS.
2. Whether the petitioners are liable for additions to tax under section 6653(a) for negligence.

Holding

1. No, because the IRS's method of reconstructing the petitioners' toke income was

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

reasonable and not arbitrary or excessive.
2. Yes, because the petitioners failed to maintain adequate records of their toke income, justifying the imposition of negligence penalties.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the principle that the IRS has broad latitude in reconstructing a taxpayer's income when the taxpayer fails to maintain adequate records. The court found the IRS's surveillance method reasonable despite minor discrepancies, as the agents observed the toke exchanges from various vantage points in a public area. The court rejected the petitioners' arguments that the surveillance data was unreliable, noting that any errors were likely to result in conservative estimates. The use of a 95% confidence level further ensured the accuracy of the IRS's calculations. The court also upheld the negligence penalties, citing the petitioners' failure to keep adequate records as required by section 6001. The court referenced several cases to support its reasoning, including Olk v. United States, Welch v. Helvering, and Meneguzzo v. Commissioner.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the IRS's ability to use indirect methods to reconstruct income when taxpayers fail to report it accurately. Legal practitioners should advise clients in similar situations to maintain detailed records of all income, including tips and gratuities. The case may influence how the IRS approaches income reconstruction in other industries where tips are common, such as restaurants and hospitality. Businesses should be aware that the IRS may employ surveillance techniques to verify income, even if those methods are not perfect. Subsequent cases, such as Cracchiola v. Commissioner, have cited Arrighi to support the use of average tip figures in income reconstruction without requiring a confidence level.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.