Callahan v. Comm'r, 130 T. C. 44 (2008)

In Callahan v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that it has jurisdiction to review IRS determinations involving frivolous return penalties under the amended Section 6330 of the Internal Revenue Code. The court also held that taxpayers may challenge these penalties during collection due process hearings, rejecting the IRS's motion for summary judgment due to unresolved factual disputes about the penalties' imposition.

Parties

Dudley Joseph Callahan and Myrna Dupuy Callahan, as petitioners, brought this case against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as respondent. The Callahans represented themselves pro se, while the Commissioner was represented by Scott T. Welch.

Facts

Dudley and Myrna Callahan filed their 2003 Form 1040 and Form 843 with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), seeking refunds and alleging over-assessment and illegal garnishment of wages. On their Form 1040, the Callahans reported income, tax withheld, and claimed a refund, while noting that certain payments were illegal garnishments. Their Form 843 requested a refund of all amounts collected by the IRS, including penalties and interest, citing violations of their rights under the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights. The IRS assessed two $500 frivolous return penalties against the Callahans for these filings under Section 6702 of the Internal Revenue Code. After receiving a final notice of intent to levy, the Callahans requested a hearing under Section 6330. They challenged the penalties during the hearing, but the IRS's Appeals officer issued a notice of determination denying relief. The Callahans then petitioned the Tax Court, leading to the IRS's motion for summary judgment.

Procedural History

The IRS assessed the frivolous return penalties against the Callahans in 2005. After receiving a final notice of intent to levy in 2006, the Callahans requested a collection due process hearing under Section 6330. The IRS treated the request as pertaining to the 2003 tax year. Following the hearing, the IRS issued a notice of determination denying relief from the penalties. The Callahans timely filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court, contesting the IRS's determination. The IRS filed a motion for summary judgment, arguing that the frivolous return penalties were self-assessed and that the Tax Court lacked jurisdiction over them. The court granted the IRS's motion to deem undenied allegations in the answer as admitted under Rule 37(c) of the Tax Court Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Issue(s)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction to review the IRS's determination under Section 6330 when the underlying tax liability consists of frivolous return penalties.

2. Whether the Callahans may challenge the frivolous return penalties during a Section 6330 hearing.

3. Whether the IRS is entitled to summary judgment on the frivolous return penalties.

Rule(s) of Law

1. Section 6330(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Pension Protection Act of 2006, provides that the Tax Court has jurisdiction to review determinations issued under Section 6330.

2. Section 6330(c)(2)(B) allows taxpayers to raise challenges to the underlying tax liability at a Section 6330 hearing if they did not receive a statutory notice of deficiency or otherwise have an opportunity to dispute such tax liability.

3. Under Section 6702, a $500 civil penalty may be assessed against a taxpayer if: (1) the taxpayer files a document that purports to be an income tax return, (2) the purported return lacks the information needed to judge the substantial correctness of the self-assessment or contains information indicating the self-assessment is substantially incorrect, and (3) the taxpayer's position is frivolous or demonstrates a desire to delay or impede the administration of Federal income tax laws.

Holding

1. The Tax Court has jurisdiction to review the IRS's determination under Section 6330 when the underlying tax liability consists of frivolous return penalties.

2. The Callahans may challenge the frivolous return penalties during a Section 6330 hearing because they did not receive a statutory notice of deficiency or otherwise have an opportunity to dispute the penalties.

3. The IRS is not entitled to summary judgment because there are genuine issues of material fact regarding whether the Callahans' filings constituted a frivolous position or a desire to delay or impede the administration of Federal income tax laws.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning focused on the amendments to Section 6330(d)(1) by the Pension Protection Act of 2006, which expanded the Tax Court's jurisdiction to include review of the IRS's collection activities regardless of the type of underlying tax involved. The court interpreted the phrase "underlying tax liability" in Section 6330(c)(2)(B) to include frivolous return penalties, as these penalties are owed

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

pursuant to Section 6702 and are subject to the IRS's collection activities. The court rejected the IRS's argument that the frivolous return penalties were self-assessed, noting that these penalties are determined and assessed by the IRS. The court also found that the Callahans' filings did not contain arguments substantially similar to those previously held to be frivolous or indicative of a desire to delay or impede the administration of Federal income tax laws. Therefore, the court held that genuine issues of material fact remained regarding the imposition of the frivolous return penalties, and the IRS's motion for summary judgment was denied.

Disposition

The court denied the IRS's motion for summary judgment, allowing the case to proceed to trial on the merits of the frivolous return penalties.

Significance/Impact

Callahan v. Comm'r is significant because it clarifies the Tax Court's jurisdiction over frivolous return penalties in the context of collection due process hearings under Section 6330. The decision expands the rights of taxpayers to challenge these penalties during such hearings, particularly in light of the amendments to Section 6330 by the Pension Protection Act of 2006. The case also highlights the importance of factual development in determining whether a taxpayer's position is frivolous or demonstrates a desire to delay or impede tax administration. Subsequent courts have relied on this decision to affirm the Tax Court's jurisdiction over frivolous return penalties and to emphasize the need for a thorough review of the underlying facts in such cases.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.