Woodral v. Commissioner, 111 T. C. 19 (1998)

The Tax Court has jurisdiction to review the Commissioner's refusal to abate interest under section 6404(g), but the Commissioner's decision not to abate interest on employment taxes was not an abuse of discretion.

Summary

In Woodral v. Commissioner, the Tax Court held that it had jurisdiction under section 6404(g) to review the Commissioner's refusal to abate interest on employment taxes, but found no abuse of discretion in the Commissioner's decision. The case arose from William Woodral's petition to abate interest on unpaid employment taxes from his dissolved partnership, Woody's Transport. Despite a seven-year delay in notification, the court determined that the interest was not excessive, assessed after the statute of limitations, or erroneously assessed, thus upholding the Commissioner's refusal to abate the interest under section 6404(a). Furthermore, the court ruled that the Commissioner lacked authority to abate interest on employment taxes under section 6404(e).

Facts

In 1988, William Woodral and his brother Robert were partners in Woody's Transport, which dissolved in July 1988. Robert agreed to pay any existing tax liabilities. In 1989, the IRS assessed employment taxes and interest against the partnership based on returns filed by Robert, who did not inform William of the liabilities. William first learned of the taxes in July 1995, and paid the tax liabilities in February 1996, but not the interest. After the Commissioner denied their request to abate interest, William and his wife filed a petition with the Tax Court.

Procedural History

The petitioners filed a petition in 1996, which was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction due to the absence of a notice of final determination. After receiving such a notice in March 1998, they filed an amended petition. The Tax Court granted the motion to dismiss the original petition, accepted the amended petition for review under section 6404(g), and struck the portion requesting penalty abatement for lack of jurisdiction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction under section 6404(g) to review the Commissioner's refusal to abate interest on employment taxes?
2. Whether the Commissioner abused his discretion by refusing to abate interest under section 6404(a)?
3. Whether the Commissioner abused his discretion by refusing to abate interest under section 6404(e)?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the plain language of section 6404(g) grants the Tax Court jurisdiction to review the Commissioner's refusal to abate interest under all subsections of section 6404.
2. No, because the interest assessed was not excessive, assessed after the expiration of the period of limitations, or erroneously or illegally assessed.
3. No, because the Commissioner lacks authority under section 6404(e) to abate interest on employment taxes.

Court's Reasoning

The court emphasized the importance of statutory language in determining jurisdiction and discretion. For jurisdiction, the court relied on the clear language of section 6404(g), rejecting the Commissioner's argument that legislative history limited jurisdiction to section 6404(e) cases. On the issue of discretion under section 6404(a), the court found that petitioners failed to prove the interest was excessive, assessed after the statute of limitations, or erroneously assessed. The court noted the petitioners' argument that the seven-year delay in notification made the interest assessment illegal, but found no legal support for this claim. Under section 6404(e), the court reasoned that this section did not apply to employment taxes as they fall under subtitle C of the Code, not covered by sections 6211 and 6212(a). Thus, the Commissioner had no discretion to abate interest under this section. The court quoted, "The Commissioner's power to abate an assessment of interest involves the exercise of discretion, and we shall give due deference to the Commissioner's discretion," highlighting the high threshold for proving an abuse of discretion.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that the Tax Court can review the Commissioner's refusal to abate interest on any tax under section 6404(g), not just income, estate, or gift taxes. However, it also sets a high bar for proving abuse of discretion under section 6404(a), requiring clear evidence that the interest was excessive, untimely, or erroneous. Practitioners should note that section 6404(e) does not apply to employment taxes, limiting the Commissioner's discretion in such cases. This ruling may affect how taxpayers approach disputes over interest abatement, emphasizing the need for strong legal arguments and evidence when challenging the Commissioner's discretion. Subsequent cases like Hospital Corp. of Am. v. Commissioner further illustrate the court's approach to statutory interpretation and discretion in tax matters.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.