Wierschem v. Commissioner, 82 T. C. 718 (1984)

A taxpayer cannot retroactively elect the installment method of reporting income after having reported the gain from a sale in full on their original tax return.

Summary

In Wierschem v. Commissioner, the petitioner sold farmland in 1976 and reported the full gain on his tax return. Although one sale qualified for installment reporting under IRC Section 453, the petitioner did not elect this method initially. The U. S. Tax Court held that once a valid method of reporting income other than the installment method is chosen on the original return, a taxpayer is bound by that election and cannot later elect the installment method. This decision reinforces the principle that tax elections are binding to ensure the orderly administration of tax laws.

Facts

Cornelius Wierschem sold three tracts of farmland in two separate transactions on May 4, 1976. He reported the full gain from these sales on his 1976 income tax return. One of these sales qualified for installment reporting under IRC Section 453, but Wierschem did not initially elect this method. He only became aware of the possibility of installment reporting during his brother's audit in 1979 and attempted to retroactively elect this method in subsequent years.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Wierschem's federal income taxes for 1976 and 1977. Wierschem petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for relief, seeking to retroactively elect the installment method for reporting the gain from the sale of one tract. The court reviewed the case and issued its decision on May 7, 1984.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a taxpayer can elect the installment method of reporting income under IRC Section 453 after having reported the gain from a sale in full on their original tax return.

Holding

1. No, because once a taxpayer elects a valid method of reporting income other than the installment method on their original tax return, they are bound by that election and cannot later elect the installment method.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court relied on the precedent set by Pacific National Co. v. Welch, which established that a taxpayer's election of a reporting method is binding and cannot be changed by filing an amended return. The court emphasized that allowing retroactive elections would disrupt the orderly administration of tax laws and impose uncertainties. Wierschem had reported the sale as a closed transaction on his original return, which was a valid method of reporting. The court distinguished cases where taxpayers had reported income in a fundamentally incorrect way, noting that Wierschem's initial reporting was correct and consistent with an election against the installment method. The court concluded that Wierschem's attempt to elect the installment method after initially reporting the gain in full was not permissible under the binding election rule.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of making informed tax elections on original returns, as these are generally binding. Taxpayers and their advisors must carefully consider all available methods of reporting income at the time of filing, as later attempts to change to the installment method will not be allowed. The ruling reinforces the stability and predictability of tax reporting, aiding in the administration of tax laws. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this principle, ensuring that taxpayers cannot disrupt settled tax liabilities by retroactively changing their reporting methods. This case also highlights the need for taxpayers to fully understand the implications of their transactions and the available reporting methods to avoid similar situations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.