

Recent Developments in Federal Income Taxation

Bruce A. McGovern

Professor of Law and Director, Tax Clinic

South Texas College of Law Houston

Houston, Texas

State Bar of Texas Tax Section

First Wednesday Tax Update

July 5, 2023

1

CLE Number for Today's Webcast:
174198530

2

**Clary Hood, Inc. v. Commissioner,
69 F.4th 168 (4th Cir. 5/31/23)**

Outline: item C.1, page 2

- The taxpayer was a subchapter C corporation.
- Clary Hood served as CEO and he and his wife were the sole shareholders and members of the board of directors.
- The corporation operated a land excavation and grading business and averaged gross revenue of \$21 million from 2000-2010, which grew to \$44 million in 2015 and \$69 million in 2016.
 - The corporation never paid any dividends.
 - Mr. Hood's annual salary ranged from \$130,000 to \$196,500.
- In part to make up for undercompensating Mr. Hood in prior years, the corporation paid him bonuses of \$5 million in each of 2015 and 2016.
- Issue: could the corporation deduct the bonuses under § 162 as reasonable compensation?
- Held: No. Only \$3.7 million is deductible for 2015 and \$1.4 million for 2016.
 - Court approved of use of multi-factor test (rather than independent investor test)
 - Court reversed Tax Court on accuracy related penalties

3

3

**Laidlaw's Harley Davidson Sales, Inc. v. Comm'r
29 F.4th 1066 (9th Cir. 3/25/22)**

Outline: item A.1.a, page 6

- An IRS revenue agent sent a 30-day letter informing the taxpayer that the IRS would assess a penalty under § 6707A for failure to report a listed transaction if the taxpayer did not respond.
- The revenue agent's supervisor did not approve the penalty until after the 30-day letter was sent and the taxpayer had filed a protest with IRS appeals.
- Issue: Whether the IRS complied with requirement of § 6751(b)(1) that the "initial determination" of the assessment of a penalty be "personally approved (in writing) by the immediate supervisor of the individual making such determination."
- Held: Yes. Contrary decision of U.S. Tax Court (154 T.C. 68 (1/16/20)) reversed.
 - When the IRS need not issue a notice of deficiency before assessing a penalty, the language of § 6751(b) contains no requirement that supervisory approval be obtained before the IRS formally communicates the penalty to the taxpayer.
 - Section 6751(b)(1) requires written supervisory approval before the assessment of the penalty or, if earlier, before the relevant supervisor loses discretion whether to approve the penalty assessment.
 - The IRS complied with this requirement.

4

4

Kroner v. Commissioner
48 F.4th 1272 (11th Cir. 9/13/22)
Outline: item A.1.b, page 7

- **Issue:** when the IRS *must issue a notice of deficiency* before assessing a penalty, can the IRS comply with the supervisory approval requirement of § 6751(b) by obtaining supervisory approval at any time before assessment of the penalty?
- **Held:** Yes. Contrary decision of U.S. Tax Court (154 T.C. 68 (1/16/20)) reversed.
 - “We disagree with Kroner and the Tax Court. We conclude that the IRS satisfies Section 6751(b) so long as a supervisor approves an initial determination of a penalty assessment before it assesses those penalties. See *Laidlaw’s Harley Davidson Sales, Inc. v. Comm’r*, 29 F.4th 1066, 1071 (9th Cir. 2022). Here, a supervisor approved Kroner’s penalties, and they have not yet been assessed. Accordingly, the IRS has not violated Section 6751(b).”

5

5

Minemyer v. Commissioner
131 A.F.T.R.2d 2023-364 (10th Cir. 01/19/23)
Outline: item A.1.c, page 9

- **Issue:** when the IRS *must issue a notice of deficiency* before assessing a penalty, when must the IRS comply with the supervisory approval requirement of § 6751(b)?
- **Held:** Before the IRS issues the notice of deficiency. Contrary decision of U.S. Tax Court (T.C. Memo. 2020-99 (7/1/20)) reversed.
 - “We agree with these assessments of § 6751(b)(1) and hold that its plain language does not require approval before proposed penalties are communicated to a taxpayer.”
 - “We are persuaded by the Second Circuit’s reasoning and hold that with respect to civil penalties, the requirements of § 6751(b)(1) are met so long as written supervisory approval of an initial determination of an assessment is obtained on or before the date the IRS issues a notice of deficiency.”

6

6

Dillon Trust Co., LLC v. United States
162 Fed. Cl. 708 (11/10/22)
Outline: item A.2, page 10

- The IRS asserted transferee liability against several trusts with a common trustee.
- The trustee deposited \$72 million with the IRS pursuant to § 6033 to stop the running of interest.
 - The trustee wrote a single check for all of the trusts and attached an allocation schedule.
- The IRS never credited the deposit to the accounts of any of the trusts and instead credited it to a general ledger account.
- More than two years later, the IRS returned the deposit.
- Issue: was the IRS obligated to return \$10 million of interest that would not have accrued had the IRS credited the deposit as requested?
- Held: No. Section 6603 is permissive and does not mandate that the IRS treat a deposit as a payment of tax.

7

7

Boechler, P.C. v. Commissioner
__ U.S. __ (4/21/22)
[Not in outline]

- Following a collection due process (CDP) hearing, the IRS issued a notice of determination upholding proposed collection action.
- Under § 6330(d)(1), the taxpayer had 30 days to contest the determination by filing a petition with the U.S. Tax Court.
- The 30-day period expired on August 28, 2017.
- Taxpayer:
 - Mailed his petition to the Tax Court on August 29, 2017 (one-day late).
 - Argued that the 30-day period should be equitably tolled.
- Issue: is the 30-day period specified in 6330(d)(1) for filing a Tax Court petition to contest an IRS notice of determination jurisdictional and therefore not subject to equitable tolling?
- Held: No. This 30-day period is not jurisdictional and *is* subject to equitable tolling.

8

8

**Hallmark Research Collective v. Commissioner,
159 T.C. No. 6 (11/29/22)
*Outline: item E.1, page 12***

- A unanimous, reviewed decision of the U.S. Tax Court.
- Issue: is the 90-day period specified in § 6213(a) for filing a Tax Court petition in response to a notice of deficiency jurisdictional, and is it subject to equitable tolling?
- Held: Yes, the 90-day period is jurisdictional. The period is not subject to equitable tolling.
 - U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *Boechler, P.C. v. Commissioner*, ___ U.S. ___ (4/21/22), does not dictate a contrary result.

9

9

**Nutt v. Commissioner,
160 T.C. No. 10 (5/2/23)
*Outline: item E.2, page 13***

- Taxpayers received a notice of deficiency.
 - Section 6213(a) provides a 90-day period
 - During this period, taxpayer can file a Tax Court petition to challenge the notice of deficiency
- The last day to file a Tax Court petition to challenge the notice of deficiency was July 18, 2022.
- Taxpayer, residing in the central time zone (in Alabama), electronically filed the Tax Court petition on:
 - July 18 at 11:05 a.m. central time
 - July 19 at 12:05 a.m. eastern time
- Issue: was the taxpayer’s petition timely filed?
- Held: No. When the “timely mailing” rule does not apply, a Tax Court petition is filed when received by the court.
 - The petition was received one-day late, on July 19, where the court is located

10

**Sanders v. Commissioner,
160 T.C. No. 16 (6/20/23)
Outline: item E.3, page 14**

- Taxpayers received a notice of deficiency.
 - Section 6213(a) provides a 90-day period
 - During this period, taxpayer can file a Tax Court petition to challenge the notice of deficiency
- The last day to file a Tax Court petition was December 12, 2022.
- Taxpayer had trouble logging into the Tax Court's system (DAWSON) on his mobile phone, and switched to his computer.
- The upload of his petition began at 12:00:09 a.m. on December 13, 2022, and the court received the petition at 12:00:11 a.m.
- Issue: was the taxpayer's petition timely filed?
- Held: No. When the "timely mailing" rule does not apply, a Tax Court petition is filed when received by the court.
 - The petition was received 11 seconds late.

11

11

**Smith v. Commissioner,
159 T.C. No. 3 (8/25/22)
Outline: item I.1, page 15**

- Taxpayer was U.S. citizen working in Australia, received a notice of deficiency.
- The taxpayer signed a closing agreement with the IRS waiving the right to claim the foreign earned income exclusion of section 911 for 2016-2018.
- The taxpayer later filed original or amended returns claiming the section 911 exclusion and the IRS issued refunds.
- Issues: was the closing agreement binding?
 1. Had it been signed by an appropriate IRS official?
 2. Had the IRS committed malfeasance by disclosing confidential taxpayer information under § 6103 and misrepresented material facts in the terms of the closing agreement.
- Held: The agreement is binding. Both arguments rejected.

12

12

**United States v. Meyer,
50 F.4th 23 (11th Cir. 9/26/22)**

Outline: item I.2, page 15

- The taxpayer in this case, Michael L. Meyer, was sued in 2018 by the U.S. Department of Justice (the “2018 litigation”) for promoting bogus charitable deduction tax-evasion schemes.
- The 2018 litigation settled and ostensibly was “closed” in 2019 when the U.S. District Court entered a permanent injunction against Mr. Meyer.
- In 2020, the IRS assessed penalties against Mr. Meyer under § 6700 (promoting abusive tax shelters).
- Taxpayer filed a motion for a protective order in the same U.S. District Court that handled the 2018 litigation.
- Issue: is taxpayer’s motion barred by the Anti-Injunction Act?
- Held: No. The term “suit” used in the Anti-Injunction Act does not extend to a defensive motion filed in connection with the 2018 litigation.

13