Elliott v. Commissioner, 110 T. C. 174 (1998)

An unsigned tax return submitted by an agent without proper authorization does not constitute a valid return for statute of limitations purposes.

Summary

In Elliott v. Commissioner, the taxpayer argued that a 1990 tax return, filed by his attorney without a proper power of attorney, started the statute of limitations. The Tax Court held that the return was invalid because it lacked the taxpayer's signature and the required power of attorney, thus the IRS was not barred from assessing a deficiency. The decision underscored the necessity of adhering to IRS regulations regarding the filing of returns by agents, impacting how taxpayers and their representatives must approach return submissions.

Facts

The taxpayer, Elliott, requested an extension to file his 1990 federal income tax return. On October 17, 1991, his attorney, John H. Trader, submitted an unsigned Form 1040 on Elliott's behalf, signing it under a power of attorney. However, no power of attorney was attached, and Trader did not have written authorization to file the return. The IRS returned the form, requesting a power of attorney, which was not provided until July 1993. The IRS issued a notice of deficiency on October 10, 1995.

Procedural History

Elliott contested the IRS's determination of a deficiency for his 1990 taxes and an addition to tax, arguing the statute of limitations had expired. The case was assigned to a Special Trial Judge, whose opinion was adopted by the Tax Court. The court addressed whether the unsigned return started the statute of limitations and whether the addition to tax under section 6651(a)(1) was applicable.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the statute of limitations barred the IRS from assessing a deficiency for the 1990 tax year because of the unsigned return submitted by the taxpayer's attorney.
2. Whether the taxpayer is liable for an addition to tax under section 6651(a)(1) for failing to file a timely return for 1990.

Holding

1. No, because the unsigned return submitted by the attorney did not comply with IRS regulations requiring a signature or a valid power of attorney, thus it was not a valid return that could start the statute of limitations.
2. Yes, because the taxpayer failed to file a timely return, and the addition to tax

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

under section 6651(a)(1) was applicable as the failure was not due to reasonable cause.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court relied on IRS regulations under sections 6011(a), 6061, and 6065, which require a tax return to be signed by the taxpayer or an agent with a valid power of attorney. The court found that the return submitted by Trader did not meet these requirements, as it lacked Elliott’s signature and the necessary power of attorney. The court distinguished this case from others like Miller v. Commissioner, where the taxpayer’s wife signed with actual authority. The court also upheld the validity of the IRS regulation, noting it was not arbitrary or capricious. For the addition to tax, the court cited United States v. Boyle, stating that delegating the filing to an agent does not excuse the taxpayer from timely filing responsibilities.

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the importance of strict adherence to IRS regulations when filing tax returns through an agent. Taxpayers and their representatives must ensure returns are properly signed or accompanied by a valid power of attorney to start the statute of limitations. The ruling may affect how tax professionals advise clients on filing procedures, reinforcing the need for direct taxpayer involvement or clear delegation of authority. It also serves as a reminder of the taxpayer’s responsibility for timely filing, even when using an agent. Subsequent cases may reference Elliott to uphold the validity of similar IRS regulations or to argue the necessity of proper authorization in tax filings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.