Neely v. Commissioner, 115 T. C. 287 (2000)

The U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction to address statute of limitations issues in worker classification cases brought under section 7436 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

Neely contested the IRS's determination that three service providers were his employees for employment tax purposes in 1992, claiming the assessment was time-barred under the three-year statute of limitations. The IRS argued that the limitations period remained open due to Neely's alleged fraud. The Tax Court held that once jurisdiction is properly invoked under section 7436 for worker classification, it extends to deciding whether the determination is barred by the statute of limitations under section 6501, including fraud allegations. This decision clarified the Tax Court's jurisdiction over limitations issues in worker classification disputes.

Facts

In 1992, U. R. Neely operated a sole proprietorship in Mesa, Arizona. The IRS determined that three individuals who provided services to Neely's business were employees for employment tax purposes. Neely filed a petition challenging this determination, asserting it was barred by the three-year statute of limitations under section 6501(a). The IRS claimed the statute of limitations remained open due to Neely's alleged fraudulent conduct under section 6501(c).

Procedural History

The IRS issued a Notice of Determination Concerning Worker Classification to Neely on June 11, 1998. Neely filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court on September 8, 1998, contesting the worker classification and claiming the determination was time-barred. The IRS responded, alleging fraud to keep the statute of limitations open. The Tax Court raised the issue of its jurisdiction over the statute of limitations and fraud allegations in the context of a section 7436 case.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction to decide if the IRS's worker classification determination is barred by the expiration of the statute of limitations under section 6501 in a case brought under section 7436.
2. Whether the Tax Court can address allegations of fraud that affect the statute of limitations in such cases.

Holding

1. Yes, because once jurisdiction is invoked under section 7436, the court can address statute of limitations issues as an affirmative defense without needing

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

additional jurisdiction.
2. Yes, because the court can decide whether the fraud exception under section 6501(c) applies when it is properly raised by the parties in a section 7436 case.

Court's Reasoning

The court's jurisdiction under section 7436 is limited to determining worker classification and the applicability of the section 530 safe harbor. However, once jurisdiction is properly invoked, the court can address affirmative defenses, including the statute of limitations under section 6501. The court reasoned that the statute of limitations is a substantive matter that can be raised as a defense, and once raised, the court must pass upon its merits. The court also noted that it can decide whether the fraud exception applies under section 6501(c) without additional jurisdiction. The court rejected the IRS's argument that it lacked jurisdiction over the limitations issue, emphasizing that jurisdiction cannot be conferred by agreement of the parties but must be based on statutory authority.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that the Tax Court has jurisdiction over statute of limitations issues in worker classification cases, allowing taxpayers to raise such defenses in section 7436 proceedings. Practitioners should be aware that they can challenge the timeliness of IRS determinations in these cases, including allegations of fraud that might keep the limitations period open. This ruling may encourage taxpayers to more aggressively litigate worker classification disputes, knowing that the court can fully adjudicate related statute of limitations issues. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, solidifying the court's jurisdiction in this area.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.