Izen v. Commissioner, 64 T. C. 919 (1975)

The Tax Court lacks jurisdiction over tax deficiencies when a taxpayer files for bankruptcy after receiving a notice of deficiency but before filing a Tax Court petition, though it retains jurisdiction over nonpecuniary tax penalties not claimed in bankruptcy.

Summary

In Izen v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed its jurisdiction over tax deficiencies and penalties when taxpayers file for bankruptcy. The court held that it lacked jurisdiction over the tax deficiencies for both Joe A. Izen, who never received a statutory notice of deficiency, and Faye J. Izen, who filed her Tax Court petition after filing for bankruptcy under Chapter XI. However, the court retained jurisdiction over the negligence penalties assessed against Faye J. Izen for 1970 and 1971, as these penalties were not claimed in the bankruptcy proceedings. This ruling clarifies the jurisdictional limits of the Tax Court in the context of bankruptcy, emphasizing the need for timely filing of Tax Court petitions relative to bankruptcy proceedings.

Facts

Joe A. Izen and Faye J. Izen, married during the relevant years, filed separate federal income tax returns for 1968-1970 and a joint return for 1971. The IRS sent Faye J. Izen a statutory notice of deficiency on September 18, 1974, for the years 1968-1971, including tax deficiencies and an addition to tax for negligence in 1970 and 1971. Joe A. Izen never received a statutory notice of deficiency. Joe A. Izen filed for bankruptcy under Chapter XI on February 5, 1974, and the IRS assessed taxes against him on June 24, 1974, under Section 6871(a). Faye J. Izen filed for bankruptcy on November 12, 1974, and the IRS assessed taxes against her on May 21, 1975, under the same section. The IRS filed proofs of claim in both bankruptcy proceedings but did not include the negligence penalties in these claims.

Procedural History

On December 4, 1974, the Izens filed a petition in the Tax Court contesting the deficiencies and penalties. The IRS moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction regarding Joe A. Izen and to change the caption. On January 14, 1975, the IRS filed a motion to dismiss the entire case for lack of jurisdiction, and the Izens moved for a continuance until the resolution of the bankruptcy proceedings. The Tax Court heard these motions on June 5, 1975, and issued its opinion on August 21, 1975.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction over Joe A. Izen’s tax deficiencies when no statutory notice of deficiency was sent to him.
2. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction over Faye J. Izen’s tax deficiencies when

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

she filed her Tax Court petition after filing for bankruptcy.
3. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction over the negligence penalties assessed against Faye J. Izen for the years 1970 and 1971.

Holding

1. No, because no statutory notice of deficiency was sent to Joe A. Izen, as required by Section 6212, and thus the Tax Court lacked jurisdiction over his tax deficiencies.
2. No, because Faye J. Izen filed her Tax Court petition after filing for bankruptcy, which divested the Tax Court of jurisdiction over her tax deficiencies under Section 6871(b).
3. Yes, because the negligence penalties assessed against Faye J. Izen for 1970 and 1971 were not claimed in the bankruptcy proceedings and are nonpecuniary loss penalties, which the Tax Court retains jurisdiction over under the precedent set in John V. Prather.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court's jurisdiction is limited to cases where a petition is filed within the time provided in Section 6213(a) after the mailing of a statutory notice of deficiency as required by Section 6212. The court found that it lacked jurisdiction over Joe A. Izen's deficiencies because he never received such a notice. For Faye J. Izen, the court applied Section 6871(b), which prohibits the filing of a Tax Court petition after the filing of a bankruptcy petition, thus divesting the court of jurisdiction over her tax deficiencies. However, the court distinguished the negligence penalties under Section 6653(a) as nonpecuniary loss penalties, which cannot be claimed in bankruptcy under Simonson v. Granquist and Revenue Ruling 62-96. Following the precedent in John V. Prather, the court retained jurisdiction over these penalties because they were not part of the bankruptcy claims.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of timing in filing Tax Court petitions relative to bankruptcy proceedings. Practitioners must ensure that Tax Court petitions are filed before any bankruptcy filing to maintain jurisdiction over tax deficiencies. The ruling also clarifies that the Tax Court retains jurisdiction over nonpecuniary loss penalties not claimed in bankruptcy, providing a forum for taxpayers to contest such penalties. This case has influenced subsequent rulings and practices, particularly in how the IRS handles claims in bankruptcy proceedings and how taxpayers navigate their rights to appeal tax deficiencies and penalties.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.