Wheeler v. Commissioner, 127 T. C. 200 (U. S. Tax Ct. 2006)

In Wheeler v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court clarified the IRS's burden of production for tax penalties. Charles Raymond Wheeler, who failed to file his 2003 tax return, challenged the IRS's notice of deficiency and additional tax penalties. The court upheld the income tax deficiency but ruled that the IRS did not meet its burden of production for the failure-to-pay and estimated tax penalties due to inadequate evidence. This decision underscores the necessity for the IRS to provide sufficient proof when imposing penalties, impacting how tax disputes are handled.

Parties

Charles Raymond Wheeler (Petitioner), pro se, at trial and appeal stages. Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent), represented by Joan E. Steele, at trial and appeal stages.

Facts

Charles Raymond Wheeler, a resident of Colorado Springs, Colorado, did not file a Federal income tax return for the year 2003. The IRS issued a notice of deficiency to Wheeler, determining that he failed to report taxable income from retirement distributions, dividends, and interest, amounting to a tax deficiency of $9,507. The IRS also determined additions to tax under sections 6651(a)(1), 6651(a)(2), and 6654 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC) due to Wheeler's failure to file a return, pay the tax shown on a return, and make estimated tax payments, respectively. Wheeler petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency and the additions to tax.

Procedural History

Wheeler timely petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for redetermination of the deficiency and additions to tax on August 24, 2005. At a pretrial conference on April 17, 2006, Wheeler was warned about the frivolous nature of his arguments and the potential imposition of penalties under section 6673 of the IRC. The IRS moved for the imposition of a penalty under section 6673(a)(1) at trial. The court heard the case and issued its opinion on December 6, 2006.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the IRS issued a valid notice of deficiency for Wheeler's 2003 taxable year?
2. Whether Wheeler is liable for an addition to tax under section 6651(a)(1) for failing to file his 2003 Federal income tax return?
3. Whether Wheeler is liable for an addition to tax under section 6651(a)(2) for failing to pay the amount shown as tax on a return?
4. Whether Wheeler is liable for an addition to tax under section 6654 for failing to pay estimated taxes?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

5. Whether the court should impose a penalty under section 6673?

Rule(s) of Law

1. *Section 6212(a), IRC*: Authorizes the Secretary to send a notice of deficiency to a taxpayer by certified or registered mail if a deficiency is determined.
2. *Section 7522(a), IRC*: Requires a notice of deficiency to describe the basis for, and identify the amounts of, the tax due, interest, additional amounts, additions to the tax, and assessable penalties included in such notice.
3. *Section 7491(c), IRC*: The Commissioner has the burden of production in court proceedings regarding the liability of any individual for any penalty, addition to tax, or additional amount imposed by the IRC.
4. *Section 6651(a)(1), IRC*: Imposes an addition to tax for failure to file a timely return unless the taxpayer proves such failure is due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect.
5. *Section 6651(a)(2), IRC*: Imposes an addition to tax for failure to pay the amount of tax shown on a return.
6. *Section 6654, IRC*: Imposes an addition to tax on an individual taxpayer who underpays estimated tax.
7. *Section 6673(a)(1), IRC*: Authorizes the court to require a taxpayer to pay a penalty, not to exceed $25,000, if the taxpayer has instituted or maintained a proceeding primarily for delay or if the taxpayer's position is frivolous or groundless.

Holding

1. The court held that the notice of deficiency was valid because it met the requirements of sections 6212 and 7522 of the IRC.
2. Wheeler is liable for the addition to tax under section 6651(a)(1) because he failed to file his 2003 tax return, and the IRS met its burden of production by showing Wheeler's failure to file.
3. The court held that the IRS did not meet its burden of production under section 7491(c) for the addition to tax under section 6651(a)(2) because it failed to introduce evidence that a return showing the tax liability was filed for 2003, either by Wheeler or through a substitute for return (SFR) meeting the requirements of section 6020(b).
4. The court found that the IRS did not satisfy its burden of production under section 7491(c) for the addition to tax under section 6654 because it failed to introduce evidence that Wheeler had a required annual payment under section 6654(d) for 2003.
5. The court imposed a penalty of $1,500 under section 6673(a)(1) on Wheeler for maintaining a proceeding primarily for delay and for asserting frivolous and groundless arguments.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning was based on the statutory requirements and the evidence

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

presented. For the validity of the notice of deficiency, the court reasoned that the notice met the legal requirements of sections 6212 and 7522 despite not citing specific Code sections, as the notice described the adjustments and identified the amounts of tax and additions to tax. Regarding the section 6651(a)(1) addition to tax, the court found that the IRS met its burden of production by showing Wheeler's failure to file a return, and Wheeler did not provide evidence of reasonable cause. For the section 6651(a)(2) addition to tax, the court emphasized the necessity of an SFR meeting the requirements of section 6020(b) and found the IRS's evidence insufficient. For the section 6654 addition to tax, the court highlighted the complexity of the section and the IRS's failure to provide evidence of Wheeler's required annual payment for 2003. Finally, the court imposed the section 6673 penalty due to Wheeler's persistent frivolous arguments and failure to heed warnings, despite limited cooperation.
The court's analysis included legal tests applied under sections 6212, 7522, 7491(c), 6651, 6654, and 6673, policy considerations regarding the burden of production, and the treatment of Wheeler's frivolous arguments. The court also considered Wheeler's prior cases and the necessity of deterring such arguments to protect judicial resources.

Disposition

The court upheld the income tax deficiency of $3,854 after concessions by the IRS, sustained the addition to tax under section 6651(a)(1), and rejected the additions to tax under sections 6651(a)(2) and 6654. The court imposed a penalty of $1,500 under section 6673(a)(1). The case was to be decided under Rule 155 of the Tax Court Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Significance/Impact

The Wheeler case is significant for its clarification of the IRS's burden of production under section 7491(c) for tax penalties and additions to tax. It underscores the necessity for the IRS to provide sufficient evidence to support the imposition of penalties, particularly when a taxpayer does not file a return or make estimated tax payments. The decision also reinforces the court's authority to impose penalties under section 6673 for frivolous arguments, impacting how taxpayers and the IRS approach tax disputes. Subsequent cases have cited Wheeler for its holdings on the burden of production and the requirements for valid SFRs. Practically, the case serves as a reminder to taxpayers and their representatives of the importance of filing returns and making estimated tax payments, and to the IRS of the evidentiary requirements when seeking to impose penalties.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.