Cox v. Comm'r, 126 T. C. 237 (2006)

In Cox v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court upheld IRS collection actions against taxpayers Louis and Christine Cox for tax years 2000, 2001, and 2002. The court found that the administrative record was adequate for judicial review and that the Appeals officer's involvement in prior years did not disqualify him from handling subsequent years. The decision underscores the importance of current tax compliance and the need for taxpayers to substantiate claims for collection alternatives, reinforcing the IRS's discretion in collection matters.

Parties

Louis A. Cox and Christine Cox, Petitioners, were the taxpayers challenging the IRS's proposed collection actions. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, represented the IRS in these consolidated cases.

Facts

Louis A. Cox operated a consulting engineering and software development business as a sole proprietorship and through Cox Associates, Inc. , an S corporation. The Coxes filed late tax returns for 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and did not pay the assessed taxes. The IRS issued notices of intent to levy for these years, prompting the Coxes to request hearings. The Appeals officer, Bruce H. Skidmore, conducted simultaneous equivalent hearings for 1999 and collection hearings for 2000, and later handled hearings for 2001 and 2002. The Coxes sought collection alternatives, including installment agreements and offers in compromise, but were unable to provide sufficient financial information to support their requests. Skidmore determined that the Coxes had not established current tax compliance or financial hardship justifying alternatives to levy.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of determination sustaining the proposed levy actions for 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. The Coxes filed petitions with the U. S. Tax Court challenging these determinations. The cases were consolidated and submitted fully stipulated. The court reviewed the administrative record, which included extensive notes and correspondence from Skidmore, and upheld the IRS's determinations, except as modified by settlements between the parties regarding certain tax additions.

Issue(s)

Whether the administrative record and notices of determination were sufficient to support meaningful judicial review?

Whether the Appeals officer was disqualified from conducting the collection hearing for 2001 and 2002 due to prior involvement in the 1999 and 2000 hearings?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Whether the IRS's determinations to proceed with collection actions for tax years 2000, 2001, and 2002 constituted an abuse of discretion?

Rule(s) of Law

Under Section 6320 and Section 6330 of the Internal Revenue Code, taxpayers are entitled to a collection due process (CDP) hearing before an impartial Appeals officer. The officer must verify that the IRS complied with applicable legal and administrative requirements and consider any issues raised by the taxpayer, including collection alternatives. The Tax Court reviews the IRS's determination for abuse of discretion unless the underlying tax liability is at issue, in which case it conducts a de novo review.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the administrative record and notices of determination were sufficient to support meaningful judicial review. The Appeals officer was not disqualified from conducting the collection hearing for 2001 and 2002 due to prior involvement in the 1999 and 2000 hearings, as his prior consideration of later years was incidental. The court also held that the IRS's determinations to proceed with collection actions for tax years 2000, 2001, and 2002 did not constitute an abuse of discretion, except as modified by settlements between the parties.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the administrative record, consisting of extensive notes and correspondence, provided a clear portrayal of the administrative process, supporting judicial review. The court distinguished prior involvement in earlier collection proceedings from disqualifying involvement under Section 6320 and Section 6330, noting that Skidmore's involvement with 2001 and 2002 during the 2000 hearing was not disqualifying. The court found no evidence of bias or prejudice in Skidmore's handling of the cases. Regarding the abuse of discretion, the court found that the Coxes failed to establish current tax compliance or substantiate their claims for collection alternatives. The court emphasized the importance of current compliance and the need for taxpayers to provide sufficient financial information to support their claims.

Disposition

The Tax Court sustained the IRS's determinations to proceed with collection actions for tax years 2000, 2001, and 2002, except as modified by settlements between the parties.

Significance/Impact

Cox v. Comm'r clarifies the standards for judicial review of IRS collection due process hearings and the scope of prior involvement that may disqualify an Appeals

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

officer. The case reinforces the IRS's discretion in evaluating collection alternatives and the importance of taxpayers providing sufficient evidence to support their claims. It also highlights the need for current tax compliance as a prerequisite for collection alternatives, emphasizing the policy against pyramiding tax liabilities. Subsequent courts have cited Cox in upholding IRS collection actions and evaluating the impartiality of Appeals officers.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.