Price v. Commissioner, 102 T. C. 660 (1994)

A government's concession on a significant issue does not automatically entitle taxpayers to recover litigation costs under section 7430 if the government's position was substantially justified at the time of concession.

Summary

In Price v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court denied the petitioners' motion for litigation costs under section 7430 despite the IRS conceding the significant issue of the reasonableness of actuarial assumptions for retirement plans. The court found that the IRS's position was substantially justified at the time of concession, considering the split in trial court decisions and an appellate decision in favor of the IRS. This ruling emphasizes that a concession by the government does not automatically warrant litigation cost recovery if the government's position was reasonable based on existing law and facts.

Facts

The IRS determined tax deficiencies against Martha G. Price, Lewis E. Graham, II, and TSA/The Stanford Associates, Inc. for the years 1986 and 1987. The cases were consolidated and settled before trial, with the IRS conceding the issue of the reasonableness of actuarial assumptions for the retirement plans in question. This concession resulted in significantly reduced deficiencies. The petitioners then moved for litigation costs under section 7430, arguing the IRS's position was not substantially justified.

Procedural History

The IRS issued deficiency notices in 1991. The cases were consolidated and scheduled for trial in 1993 but were settled before trial. The petitioners filed motions for litigation costs, which the Tax Court denied, holding that the IRS's position was substantially justified at the time of concession.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the IRS's position was not substantially justified at the time it conceded the significant issue of the reasonableness of actuarial assumptions for the retirement plans.

Holding

1. No, because the IRS's position was substantially justified at the time of concession, given the split in trial court decisions and an appellate court ruling in favor of the IRS on the same issue.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court determined that the IRS's position was substantially justified until the time of concession. This was based on the fact that the issue of actuarial assumptions had been upheld by the Seventh Circuit in Jerome Mirza & Associates, Ltd. v. United States, and was pending appeal in other cases where the IRS had lost at the trial level. The court emphasized that the law was unclear, which favored the IRS on the question of reasonableness. Additionally, the court noted that a concession by the IRS does not automatically make its position unreasonable, and that encouraging early concessions benefits the judicial process. The court rejected the petitioners' assertion of harassment, finding no evidence to support it.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that a government concession does not automatically entitle taxpayers to litigation costs if the government's position was reasonable based on the law and facts at the time of concession. Practitioners should be aware that the IRS can continue litigating issues to resolve legal uncertainties, even if it ultimately concedes. This ruling encourages early concessions by the IRS when its position becomes untenable, which can streamline the resolution of tax disputes. Subsequent cases like Rhoades, McKee, & Boer v. United States have applied this principle, reinforcing the need for a thorough evaluation of the reasonableness of the government's position at the time of concession.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.