

Berkery v. Commissioner, 96 T. C. 187 (1991)

The presumption of correctness applies to tax deficiency determinations unless the taxpayer can show the determinations are arbitrary and excessive or that the Commissioner has not introduced sufficient evidence linking the taxpayer to the charged activity.

Summary

In *Berkery v. Commissioner*, the Tax Court addressed whether the IRS's determinations of tax deficiencies for unreported income from alleged illegal P-2-P sales should be presumed correct. The court upheld the presumption, finding no violation of grand jury secrecy rules and sufficient evidence connecting the petitioner to the illegal activities. The case clarified that the IRS need not rely on admissible evidence for deficiency notices and emphasized the importance of credible witness testimony in establishing the necessary link to illegal income activities.

Facts

John C. Berkery was indicted for conspiring to distribute phenyl-2-propanone (P-2-P) and possessing P-2-P with intent to distribute. Revenue agent Harry J. Schmidt prepared examination reports for Berkery's tax years 1980 and 1981, alleging unreported income from P-2-P sales. Berkery contested the IRS's deficiency determinations, arguing they were based on illegally disclosed grand jury information and lacked sufficient evidence linking him to the sales. The IRS relied on testimony from informant Ronald Raiton, who had engaged in recorded conversations with Berkery about P-2-P sales.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially decided the case in 1988, but upon joint stipulation by the parties, vacated the decision to consider new issues regarding the presumption of correctness and the evidence supporting the deficiency determinations. The court then issued a supplemental opinion in 1991, addressing these issues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the IRS's determinations in the statutory notices of deficiency should be presumed correct.
2. Whether Berkery failed to report taxable income from alleged illegal P-2-P transactions for tax years 1980 and 1981, making him liable for tax deficiencies and additions.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found no violation of grand jury secrecy rules and

sufficient evidence connecting Berkery to the P-2-P sales.

2. Yes, because Berkery did not provide sufficient evidence to challenge the IRS's determinations regarding the unreported income from P-2-P sales.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the established legal principle that IRS determinations are presumed correct unless shown to be arbitrary and excessive. It rejected Berkery's arguments that Schmidt's reports relied on illegally disclosed grand jury information, finding no evidence of such disclosures. The court also found that the IRS introduced sufficient evidence linking Berkery to P-2-P sales through Raiton's credible testimony and recorded conversations. The court emphasized that the IRS need not rely on admissible evidence to prepare deficiency notices, and the focus should be on the evidence presented at trial. The policy considerations included the difficulty taxpayers face in proving non-receipt of income and the importance of maintaining the presumption of correctness to facilitate tax enforcement.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the IRS's ability to rely on the presumption of correctness in tax deficiency cases, even when dealing with alleged illegal income. It clarifies that the IRS's evidentiary burden at trial does not require reliance on admissible evidence used in deficiency notices. For legal practitioners, this case underscores the importance of challenging the IRS's evidence directly at trial and highlights the significance of witness credibility in cases involving informants. The ruling also has implications for taxpayers involved in alleged illegal activities, emphasizing the need to provide concrete evidence to rebut the IRS's determinations. Subsequent cases have followed this ruling, further solidifying the principles established in Berkery.