American Police & Fire Foundation, Inc. v. Commissioner, 81 T. C. 699 (1983)

The burden of proof in Tax Court remains with the taxpayer even when documents are unintentionally lost by the IRS, and secondary evidence can be used to prove the contents of lost records.

Summary

In this case, the American Police & Fire Foundation, Inc. sought relief from tax deficiencies after the IRS lost some of its records during transit. The Tax Court denied the Foundation's motions to shift the burden of proof, hold the IRS in default, or grant summary judgment, ruling that the unintentional loss of documents by the IRS did not warrant such remedies. The court emphasized that the taxpayer retains the burden of proof and can use secondary evidence to reconstruct lost records. This decision underscores the importance of maintaining alternative sources of evidence and the limited impact of lost documents on tax litigation.

Facts

The American Police & Fire Foundation, Inc. , a dissolved nonprofit, faced tax deficiencies after the IRS revoked its exempt status. During preparation for trial, the IRS requested and received the Foundation's documents in Miami. An IRS agent, instructed to mail the documents to Atlanta for copying, used certified instead of registered mail, leading to the loss of some records. The Foundation moved for various remedies, including shifting the burden of proof and summary judgment, due to the lost documents.

Procedural History

The case began with the IRS issuing notices of deficiency for the years 1972-1976. The Foundation petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination. After the IRS lost some of the Foundation's records during transit, the Foundation filed multiple motions, including motions for default, summary judgment, and shifting the burden of proof. The Tax Court held an evidentiary hearing and subsequently denied all of the Foundation's motions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the unintentional loss of taxpayer's records by the IRS warrants holding the IRS in default?
2. Whether the unintentional loss of taxpayer's records by the IRS justifies shifting the burden of proof to the IRS?
3. Whether the unintentional loss of taxpayer's records by the IRS is grounds for granting summary judgment to the taxpayer?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the loss was unintentional and not attributable solely to the IRS.
2. No, because the burden of proof remains with the taxpayer, and secondary evidence can be used to reconstruct lost records.
3. No, because the loss of records does not resolve the substantive issue of the taxpayer's exempt status.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Rule 142(a) of the Tax Court Rules, which places the burden of proof on the taxpayer. The court reasoned that the unintentional loss of documents by the IRS, postal service, or the taxpayer does not shift this burden. The court cited Rule 1004 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, allowing secondary evidence to prove the contents of lost records. The court found no negligence by the IRS in handling the documents and noted that the Foundation failed to demonstrate that the lost records were material or could not be reconstructed. The court distinguished this case from others where records were illegally seized or crucial to the defense, emphasizing that the loss here was unintentional and did not affect the substantive issue of the Foundation's exempt status.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces that taxpayers must maintain the burden of proof in Tax Court, even when records are lost by the IRS. It highlights the importance of preserving alternative sources of evidence, as secondary evidence can be used to prove the contents of lost records. Taxpayers should be prepared to reconstruct lost records and not rely solely on the IRS's possession of their documents. The ruling also suggests that the IRS should exercise greater care in handling taxpayer documents, although unintentional loss does not automatically result in sanctions against the IRS. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, emphasizing the need for taxpayers to be proactive in managing their evidence in tax disputes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.