Johnson v. Commissioner, 117 T. C. 204 (2001)

In Johnson v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that it lacked jurisdiction to review the IRS's determination to collect a frivolous return penalty under sections 6320 and 6330 of the Internal Revenue Code. The case underscores the court's limited jurisdiction over certain tax penalties, impacting how taxpayers challenge IRS collection actions. This decision reinforces the separation of judicial authority between the Tax Court and district courts in tax disputes, particularly concerning frivolous return penalties.

Parties

David J. and Jo Dena Johnson (Petitioners) v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent). The Johnsons filed their petition pro se, while the Commissioner was represented by Horace Crump.

Facts

The Johnsons filed their 1994, 1995, and 1996 tax returns reporting wages as income. Subsequently, they filed amended returns asserting that wages were not taxable income and thus they had no income. The IRS assessed a frivolous return penalty under section 6702 against them for these amended returns. The Johnsons requested a collection due process hearing, which led to a notice of determination by the IRS to proceed with collection of the penalties. They appealed this determination to the U. S. Tax Court.

Procedural History

The Johnsons filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court to appeal the IRS's notice of determination to collect the frivolous return penalty. The Commissioner moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, citing previous case law that the Tax Court lacked jurisdiction over such penalties. The Tax Court granted the Commissioner's motion to dismiss based on the precedent established in Van Es v. Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether the U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction under section 6330(d)(1)(A) to review the IRS's determination to collect a frivolous return penalty assessed under section 6702?

Rule(s) of Law

The U. S. Tax Court's jurisdiction over collection actions under sections 6320 and 6330 is limited to cases where the underlying tax liability is within the court's jurisdiction. Section 6330(d)(1)(A) grants the Tax Court jurisdiction over determinations under these sections, but section 6330(d)(1)(B) specifies that if the Tax Court does not have jurisdiction over the underlying liability, the appeal should

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

go to a district court. The frivolous return penalty under section 6702 falls outside the Tax Court's deficiency jurisdiction, as established in Van Es v. Commissioner.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that it lacked jurisdiction to review the IRS's determination to collect the frivolous return penalty assessed under section 6702, in line with the precedent set by Van Es v. Commissioner.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning was primarily based on the established precedent in Van Es v. Commissioner, which clearly stated that the Tax Court does not have jurisdiction over frivolous return penalties. The majority opinion emphasized that since the court lacked jurisdiction over the underlying tax liability (the frivolous return penalty), it could not review the IRS's determination under sections 6320 and 6330. The court also addressed the issue of whether to decide if the hearing requirement under section 6330(b) was met, concluding that it would not do so in cases where jurisdiction is lacking. This decision overruled a prior holding in Meyer v. Commissioner, which had suggested that the Tax Court could review whether a hearing requirement was met even in cases where it lacked jurisdiction over the underlying tax liability. The court justified this departure from Meyer by arguing that after further experience with section 6330 cases, it was no longer appropriate to decide on the hearing requirement in cases where it lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The majority opinion also discussed the doctrine of stare decisis, asserting that the court's additional experience justified reconsidering Meyer. The concurring and dissenting opinions provided further perspectives on the court's jurisdiction and the implications of its decision, with the dissent arguing for broader jurisdiction to streamline the judicial process.

Disposition

The U. S. Tax Court granted the Commissioner's motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, affirming the IRS's determination to proceed with collection of the frivolous return penalty.

Significance/Impact

The Johnson v. Commissioner decision has significant implications for taxpayers challenging IRS collection actions related to certain penalties. It reinforces the limited jurisdiction of the U. S. Tax Court over specific tax liabilities, particularly frivolous return penalties, and the necessity for taxpayers to file appeals in the appropriate district courts for such cases. This ruling clarifies the jurisdictional boundaries between the Tax Court and district courts in tax disputes, potentially reducing confusion and litigation in tax collection cases. The decision also highlights the court's willingness to reconsider its precedents based on experience and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

practical considerations, as seen in its departure from Meyer v. Commissioner. This case serves as a reminder to taxpayers and practitioners of the importance of understanding the jurisdictional limits of the Tax Court and the need to follow IRS instructions regarding the appropriate forum for challenging collection actions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.