Patton v. Commissioner, 116 T. C. 206 (U. S. Tax Court 2001)

In Patton v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court upheld the IRS's refusal to allow a taxpayer to modify his election to expense business assets under Section 179. Sam Patton, a welder, initially classified certain assets as supplies, but the IRS reclassified them as depreciable property after an audit, which increased his taxable income. Patton sought to amend his Section 179 election to include these assets, but the IRS denied this request. The court found no abuse of discretion by the IRS, emphasizing that Patton's initial misclassification of the assets precipitated the need for change, not the IRS's actions.

Parties

Sam H. Patton, Petitioner, was the plaintiff in this case. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, was the defendant. The case was heard in the United States Tax Court.

Facts

Sam H. Patton, a self-employed welder residing in Houston, Texas, filed his 1995 Federal income tax return reporting a business loss. He elected to expense a plasma torch under Section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code but could not utilize this expense due to the reported loss. Upon examination, the IRS reclassified three assets (Miller 450 amp reach, extended reach feeder, and Webb turning roller) that Patton had initially reported as materials and supplies, determining they should be depreciated over several years. This reclassification resulted in a profit for Patton's welding business. Subsequently, Patton sought the IRS's consent to modify his Section 179 election to include these reclassified assets, which the IRS denied.

Procedural History

Patton filed a petition with the United States Tax Court challenging the IRS's refusal to consent to his modification of the Section 179 election. The case was submitted fully stipulated under Rule 122 of the Tax Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure. The court reviewed the IRS's decision under an abuse of discretion standard.

Issue(s)

Whether the Commissioner of Internal Revenue abused his discretion in refusing to grant consent to Sam H. Patton to revoke (modify or change) his 1995 election to expense depreciable business assets under Section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code?

Rule(s) of Law

Section 179(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code states that "Any election made under this section, and any specification contained in any such election, may not be

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

revoked except with the consent of the Secretary. ” The relevant regulation, Section 1. 179-5(b) of the Income Tax Regulations, specifies that the Commissioner’s consent to revoke an election “will be granted only in extraordinary circumstances. ” The court reviews the Commissioner’s discretionary administrative acts for abuse of discretion, which is found if the determination is unreasonable, arbitrary, or capricious.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the Commissioner did not abuse his discretion in refusing to consent to Patton’s request to revoke (modify) his 1995 election under Section 179.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that Patton’s need to modify his election stemmed from his initial misclassification of the assets as supplies rather than the IRS’s reclassification. The court noted that Patton could not have expensed the assets under Section 179 in 1995 due to the reported business loss, which was why he attempted to reduce income by classifying them as supplies. The court emphasized that neither the statute nor the regulations permit revocation without the Secretary’s consent and that such consent is granted only in extraordinary circumstances. The court found no evidence that the IRS’s regulations were unreasonable or did not comport with congressional intent. Furthermore, Patton’s circumstances were of his own making, and thus, the IRS’s refusal to consent was not an abuse of discretion.

Disposition

The court decided that the decision will be entered under Rule 155, reflecting the court’s holding and the concessions made by the parties.

Significance/Impact

This case underscores the strict standards applied to revoking or modifying a Section 179 election, emphasizing that such modifications require the Secretary’s consent and will only be granted in extraordinary circumstances. It also highlights the importance of accurate asset classification on tax returns and the potential consequences of misclassification. The decision reaffirms the Tax Court’s deference to the IRS’s administrative discretion in tax election matters, setting a precedent for future cases involving similar issues.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.