Urbano v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 122 T. C. 384 (U. S. Tax Court 2004)

The U. S. Tax Court in Urbano v. Comm'r ruled that taxpayers can challenge interest assessed by the IRS in lien proceedings, even after signing a consent form for a lower interest amount. The court held it had jurisdiction to review the interest calculation and denied the taxpayers' request for an abatement, emphasizing the correct application of statutory rules for interest accrual on tax deficiencies offset by net operating loss carrybacks.

Parties

William F. Urbano and Flota L. Urbano, as petitioners, challenged the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as respondent, in the United States Tax Court regarding the interest assessed on their 1993 federal income tax liability.

Facts

Following an audit of their 1993-1996 federal income tax returns, the IRS revenue agent concluded that the Urbanos owed additional taxes, penalties, and interest totaling $7,556. 09. The Urbanos signed a Form 4549-CG consenting to the immediate assessment and collection of this amount and paid it. Subsequently, the IRS service center recalculated the interest owed for 1993, finding that the revenue agent had prematurely applied net operating loss (NOL) carrybacks, resulting in an increased interest liability of $39,558. 63. The IRS filed a notice of federal tax lien to secure payment of the recalculated interest, leading the Urbanos to request a hearing and eventually challenge the interest assessment in court.

Procedural History

After the IRS filed the notice of federal tax lien to secure payment of the recalculated interest for 1993, the Urbanos requested a hearing under section 6320(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. The IRS Office of Appeals upheld the recalculated interest and sustained the lien. The Urbanos then petitioned the U. S. Tax Court under section 6330(d)(1), as applicable by section 6320(c), to review the determination. The case proceeded without trial under Rule 122 of the Tax Court Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Issue(s)

Whether the Urbanos may challenge in the Tax Court the existence and amount of interest underlying the federal tax lien after signing a Form 4549-CG consenting to a lower interest amount?

Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction to review the Urbanos' alternative claims regarding the correctness of the recalculated interest and the IRS's ability to collect it?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Whether the Urbanos' interest for 1993 must be computed according to section 6601(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code, which addresses the timing of NOL carrybacks in interest calculations?

Whether the Urbanos qualify for an abatement of interest under sections 6404(a)(1) and 6404(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Rule(s) of Law

Section 6330(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code grants the Tax Court jurisdiction to review determinations by the IRS Office of Appeals regarding the propriety of a federal tax lien, including the underlying tax liability.

Section 6601(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code mandates that interest on a deficiency is not affected by a reduction due to an NOL carryback until the filing date of the year in which the NOL arose.

Section 6404(a)(1) allows the IRS to abate an assessment of tax or liability if it is excessive in amount, but section 6404(b) prohibits claims for abatement of income taxes.

Section 6404(e)(1) permits the IRS to abate interest attributable to an error or delay in performing a ministerial act, but not for errors in applying federal tax law.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the Urbanos could challenge the existence and amount of interest underlying the federal tax lien, as the consent form they signed did not preclude them from contesting the subsequently recalculated interest.

The court determined it had jurisdiction to review the Urbanos' claims regarding the correctness of the recalculated interest and the IRS's right to collect it.

The court upheld the IRS's recalculation of interest for 1993 in accordance with section 6601(d)(1), which required the NOL carrybacks to be applied at the specified times, and found the Urbanos liable for the recalculated interest.

The court denied the Urbanos' request for an abatement of interest under sections 6404(a)(1) and 6404(e)(1), as they did not meet the statutory requirements for such relief.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning began with a jurisdictional analysis, noting that the Tax Court has the authority to review determinations regarding federal tax liens under section 6330(d)(1) when the underlying tax liability is at issue. The court distinguished the Urbano case from Aguirre v. Commissioner, where taxpayers were precluded from

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

challenging a liability they had previously waived, by emphasizing that the disputed interest was not included in the Form 4549-CG the Urbanos signed.

The court further reasoned that its jurisdiction under section 6330(d) extends to reviewing the underlying tax liability, including interest, when it is properly at issue, even if it is not a deficiency. The court rejected the Urbanos' argument that the Form 4549-CG conclusively determined their interest liability, as the form did not meet the requirements of section 7121 for a final and conclusive agreement.

Applying section 6601(d)(1), the court upheld the IRS's recalculation of interest, as the statute requires interest to accrue until the filing date of the year in which the NOL arises, regardless of when the NOL is applied to reduce the deficiency. The court found that the revenue agent's initial calculation was incorrect, and the service center's recalculation was proper.

Regarding the request for an abatement of interest, the court determined that the Urbanos did not qualify under section 6404(a)(1) due to the prohibition in section 6404(b) on claims for abatement of income tax liabilities. Additionally, the court found that the Urbanos did not qualify for an abatement under section 6404(e)(1), as the revenue agent's error was not a ministerial act but a misapplication of the law, which does not qualify for abatement.

The court's reasoning addressed the Urbanos' arguments and the applicable legal principles, concluding that the IRS's actions were in accordance with the law and that the Urbanos were liable for the recalculated interest.

Disposition

The Tax Court entered a decision in favor of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, upholding the recalculated interest and denying the Urbanos' request for an abatement.

Significance/Impact

The Urbano case is significant for clarifying the Tax Court's jurisdiction over interest disputes in lien proceedings, emphasizing that taxpayers can challenge interest assessments even after consenting to a lower amount. The case also reinforces the importance of applying statutory rules correctly, such as section 6601(d)(1), in calculating interest on tax deficiencies offset by NOL carrybacks. Furthermore, the decision underscores the limited circumstances under which interest can be abated, particularly distinguishing between ministerial acts and errors in applying tax law. This ruling impacts tax practitioners and taxpayers by providing guidance on the scope of Tax Court jurisdiction and the application of interest abatement provisions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.