Neiman v. Commissioner, 87 T. C. 101 (1986)

To establish timely filing under IRC Section 7502 using certified mail, taxpayers must provide a postmarked certified mail sender's receipt and proof of proper addressing.

Summary

In Neiman v. Commissioner, the Tax Court dismissed the case for lack of jurisdiction due to the untimely filing of a tax deficiency petition. The petitioners claimed they mailed the petition within the statutory 90-day period, but the court never received the original petition. They failed to provide a postmarked certified mail sender's receipt, which is required under IRC Section 7502 and its regulations to establish prima facie evidence of timely delivery. The court emphasized the need for strict proof of compliance with mailing regulations when the document is not received, highlighting the importance of the sender's receipt in such cases.

Facts

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency to the petitioners on May 25, 1984, for tax years 1978-1981. The petitioners claimed they mailed a petition to the Tax Court on July 26, 1984, within the 90-day period. However, the court received only a photocopy of the petition on August 22, 1985, 454 days after the notice. The original petition was never received. The petitioners provided affidavits and other indirect evidence to support their claim of timely mailing but did not produce a postmarked certified mail sender's receipt.

Procedural History

The IRS moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction on October 4, 1985, due to the untimely filing of the petition. The Tax Court assigned the case to a Special Trial Judge for a hearing, which occurred on December 18, 1985. The petitioners did not appear but filed a response and a Rule 50(c) statement. The Special Trial Judge issued an opinion recommending dismissal, which the full Tax Court adopted and issued as its final decision.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioners timely filed their petition with the Tax Court under IRC Section 7502 by mailing it via certified mail.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioners failed to provide a postmarked certified mail sender's receipt and proof that the envelope was properly addressed, as required by the regulations under IRC Section 7502.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied IRC Section 6213(a), which requires a petition to be filed within 90 days of the mailing of a deficiency notice, and IRC Section 7502, which provides a timely mailing/timely filing rule for documents sent by mail. The court emphasized that under the regulations (Section 301. 7502-1(d)(1)), to establish prima facie evidence of delivery when using certified mail, petitioners must provide a postmarked certified mail sender’s receipt and proof of proper addressing. The court rejected the petitioners’ indirect evidence (affidavits, business records) as insufficient without the sender’s receipt, citing the need for strict proof to prevent abuse of the mailing rule. The court distinguished this case from Wood v. Commissioner, where the petition was received, albeit late, and some secondary evidence was allowed. The court concluded that without the required proof, it lacked jurisdiction over the case.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of retaining and presenting a postmarked certified mail sender’s receipt when relying on IRC Section 7502 to establish timely filing. Taxpayers and practitioners must be diligent in documenting and preserving proof of mailing to avoid dismissal for lack of jurisdiction. The case highlights that indirect evidence, such as affidavits and business records, is insufficient without the sender’s receipt when the document is not received. This ruling may lead to more cautious mailing practices and increased use of registered mail or electronic filing methods that provide clear proof of delivery. Subsequent cases, such as Miller v. United States, have applied similar reasoning in other contexts, reinforcing the strict proof requirement for timely filing claims.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.