Estate of Harry Rosenberg, Marc A. Rosenberg, Executor, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 73 T. C. 1014 (1980)

The Tax Court lacks jurisdiction to hear a case filed beyond the statutory period, even in cases of attorney misconduct.

Summary

The Estate of Rosenberg case highlights the strict jurisdictional limits of the Tax Court. The estate's attorney, Hacker, failed to file a petition within the 90-day period required by Section 6213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, despite repeatedly misrepresenting to the executor that he had done so. When a new attorney filed the petition 697 days late, the Tax Court dismissed it for lack of jurisdiction, holding that neither equitable relief nor the concept of fraud on the court could extend its jurisdiction beyond statutory limits. This decision underscores the necessity of timely filing and the limited power of the Tax Court to consider attorney misconduct as a basis for jurisdiction.

Facts

Harry Rosenberg died on July 2, 1973, and Marc A. Rosenberg was appointed executor of the estate. The IRS issued a notice of deficiency on September 23, 1977, determining an estate tax liability of $11,520. Prior to November 1977, Rosenberg retained attorney Melvyn S. Hacker to file a petition with the Tax Court. Hacker repeatedly misrepresented to Rosenberg that he had filed the petition, but no petition was ever filed. On August 21, 1979, 697 days after the notice of deficiency was mailed, a new attorney filed the petition, which was hand-delivered to the court.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency on September 23, 1977. The executor retained Hacker to file a petition, but no petition was filed within the 90-day statutory period. On August 21, 1979, a new attorney filed a petition, which the Tax Court received and filed. The Commissioner moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, and the Tax Court granted the motion on March 5, 1980.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction over a petition filed 697 days after the notice of deficiency was mailed, despite the attorney's failure to file within the statutory period.
2. Whether the attorney's misconduct constitutes a fraud on the court, allowing the Tax Court to exercise jurisdiction.

Holding

1. No, because the petition was not filed within the 90-day period prescribed by

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 6213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, and the timely-mailing, timely-filing provisions of Section 7502 do not apply to hand-delivered petitions.
2. No, because the attorney's nonfeasance did not constitute a fraud on the court, as he never attempted to invoke the court's jurisdiction.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court's jurisdiction is strictly limited to what is conferred by statute, and it lacks the power to exercise broad equitable relief. The court emphasized that the 90-day filing requirement of Section 6213(a) is mandatory, and the timely-mailing, timely-filing provisions of Section 7502 do not apply to hand-delivered petitions. The court rejected the argument that Hacker's misconduct constituted a fraud on the court, stating that fraud on the court requires an attempt to defile the court itself or to manipulate its judicial machinery. Hacker's failure to file the petition did not invoke the court's jurisdiction, and thus could not constitute fraud on the court. The court cited cases such as *Stone v. Commissioner* and *Cassell v. Commissioner* to support its lack of jurisdiction over late-filed petitions.

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the importance of timely filing in tax cases and the strict jurisdictional limits of the Tax Court. Attorneys must ensure that petitions are filed within the statutory period, as the court will not consider equitable arguments or attorney misconduct as a basis for extending its jurisdiction. Taxpayers and their counsel must be vigilant in monitoring the progress of their cases and be prepared to seek alternative remedies if their attorneys fail to act diligently. This case also highlights the need for clear communication between attorneys and clients regarding the status of legal proceedings. Subsequent cases, such as *Feistman v. Commissioner*, have reaffirmed the Tax Court's limited jurisdiction and its inability to provide equitable relief in similar circumstances.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.