

***Estate of Edward Wenner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 116 T. C. 284 (U. S. Tax Ct. 2001)***

In a groundbreaking ruling, the U. S. Tax Court in *Estate of Edward Wenner* affirmed its jurisdiction to consider affirmative defenses in interest abatement proceedings under Section 6404. Dallas Clark, a petitioner, sought relief from joint liability under Section 6015, which the Commissioner moved to strike, arguing jurisdictional limits. The court held that once properly invoked in a Section 6404 case, its jurisdiction extends to all relevant affirmative defenses, including those under Section 6015, without requiring additional statutory authority.

**Parties**

Estate of Edward Wenner, deceased, represented by co-executors Merlyn Wenner Ruddell, Kate Wenner Eisner, and Jann S. Wenner, and Dallas Clark, f. k. a. Dorothy E. Wenner, as petitioners, versus the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as respondent.

**Facts**

Edward Wenner died in 1988. In March 1990, Kate Wenner Eisner, acting for the estate, and Dallas Clark (then Dorothy E. Wenner) executed a Form 870-P, agreeing to an assessment and collection of deficiency in tax for partnership adjustments. On September 29, 1997, the Commissioner sent notices of changes to the 1982, 1983, and 1984 joint Federal income tax returns of Edward and Dorothy Wenner, increasing the tax and charging interest. In February 1998, the petitioners paid the assessed taxes. Subsequently, they requested abatement of the interest, which the Commissioner denied on January 20, 1999. The petitioners filed a timely petition for review of this denial on July 16, 1999, with Dallas Clark also seeking relief from joint liability under Section 6015.

**Procedural History**

The petitioners filed a petition for review of the Commissioner's denial of their request for interest abatement under Section 6404. Dallas Clark included a claim for relief from joint liability under Section 6015 in the petition. The Commissioner moved to strike this claim, asserting that the Tax Court lacked jurisdiction to consider it in a Section 6404 proceeding. The Tax Court, after considering the arguments, denied the Commissioner's motion to strike.

**Issue(s)**

Whether the U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction to decide an affirmative defense under Section 6015 pled in a petition for judicial review of the Commissioner's determination not to abate interest under Section 6404?

**Rule(s) of Law**

The Tax Court's jurisdiction to review the Commissioner's determination on interest abatement is provided by Section 6404(i), which allows the court to determine whether the Commissioner's failure to abate interest was an abuse of discretion. The court may also consider affirmative defenses, as established in precedents such as *Neely v. Commissioner*, 115 T. C. 287 (2000).

## **Holding**

The U. S. Tax Court held that it has jurisdiction to decide an affirmative defense under Section 6015 in a Section 6404 proceeding. The court's jurisdiction, once properly invoked, extends to all relevant affirmative defenses without requiring additional statutory authority.

## **Reasoning**

The Tax Court reasoned that its jurisdiction over Section 6404 actions encompasses the ability to consider affirmative defenses, including those under Section 6015, once jurisdiction is properly invoked. The court distinguished between standalone proceedings under Section 6015(e), which require specific procedural prerequisites, and the affirmative defense context within a Section 6404 action. The court relied on precedents such as *Neely v. Commissioner*, where it was established that no additional jurisdiction is required to address affirmative defenses in matters properly before the court. The court emphasized that an entitlement to relief under Section 6015, when pleaded as an affirmative defense, is analogous to other statutory defenses previously considered by the court. The court also noted that it lacked jurisdiction over the underlying deficiency determination in this proceeding, focusing solely on the jurisdiction over the affirmative defense.

## **Disposition**

The Tax Court denied the Commissioner's motion to strike the claim for relief from joint liability under Section 6015 from the petition.

## **Significance/Impact**

This decision expands the Tax Court's jurisdiction in interest abatement proceedings under Section 6404, allowing it to consider affirmative defenses, such as those under Section 6015, without requiring additional statutory authority. It clarifies the scope of the court's jurisdiction once properly invoked and provides a significant precedent for taxpayers seeking to raise such defenses in similar proceedings. The ruling reinforces the court's ability to address all relevant issues in a case, thereby impacting how taxpayers and the Commissioner approach litigation strategies in tax disputes.