Pollock v. Commissioner, 132 T. C. 21 (2009)

In Pollock v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that it lacked jurisdiction over Arlene Pollock's petition for innocent spouse relief under IRC section 6015(f), filed beyond the 90-day statutory limit. The case highlights the rigidity of jurisdictional deadlines in tax law, despite significant changes in legal interpretations and Congressional amendments. The decision underscores that such time limits are not subject to equitable tolling, affecting how taxpayers navigate uncertain legal landscapes.

Parties

Arlene L. Pollock (Petitioner) sought relief from joint liability for unpaid taxes under IRC section 6015. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) denied her request. Pollock's case proceeded from the Tax Court to the U. S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, which issued an order allowing her to file a petition with the Tax Court within 30 days, despite the expiration of the statutory period.

Facts

Arlene Pollock and her former husband filed joint tax returns for the years 1995-1999, resulting in a significant tax debt of over $400,000. Following their divorce in November 2000, Pollock sought innocent spouse relief under IRC section 6015(f), claiming that her former husband was responsible for the tax liabilities. On April 27, 2006, the IRS mailed a notice of determination denying her request for relief. At that time, the Tax Court's jurisdiction over section 6015(f) claims was uncertain due to conflicting circuit court decisions. Subsequently, Congress amended section 6015 to grant the Tax Court jurisdiction over such claims, effective for liabilities remaining unpaid after December 20, 2006.

Procedural History

The IRS denied Pollock's request for innocent spouse relief on April 27, 2006. Due to the prevailing legal uncertainty, Pollock did not file a petition with the Tax Court within the 90-day period specified in the notice. In July 2007, the U. S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, while hearing a lien-enforcement action against Pollock, issued an order staying the case and granting her 30 days to file a petition with the Tax Court. Pollock filed her petition on August 9, 2007, which was 469 days after the IRS mailed the notice of determination. The Commissioner moved to dismiss the petition for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that the 90-day period had expired.

Issue(s)

Whether the Tax Court has jurisdiction to review a petition for innocent spouse relief under IRC section 6015(f) that was filed more than 90 days after the IRS mailed the notice of determination, despite a subsequent Congressional amendment

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

granting jurisdiction and a District Court order equitably tolling the filing period?

Rule(s) of Law

The controlling legal principle is that IRC section 6015(e)(1)(A) sets a jurisdictional time limit of 90 days for filing a petition with the Tax Court after the IRS mails a notice of determination denying innocent spouse relief. This time limit is not subject to equitable tolling, as articulated in *United States v. Brockamp*, 519 U. S. 347 (1997), and *John R. Sand & Gravel Co. v. United States*, 552 U. S. 130 (2008).

Holding

The Tax Court held that it lacked jurisdiction over Pollock's petition because it was filed more than 90 days after the IRS mailed the notice of determination, and IRC section 6015(e)(1)(A)'s time limit is jurisdictional and not subject to equitable tolling.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning was based on the interpretation of IRC section 6015(e)(1)(A) as a jurisdictional time limit rather than a statute of limitations. The court noted that the statute explicitly uses the word "jurisdiction" and sets forth detailed rules, indicating Congress's intent to create a strict deadline. The court rejected the applicability of equitable tolling, citing precedents such as *Brockamp* and *John R. Sand & Gravel Co.* , which established that jurisdictional deadlines cannot be extended by equitable principles. The court also considered the "law of the case" doctrine but found that the District Court's order did not bind the Tax Court on this jurisdictional issue. The court acknowledged the harshness of the result but emphasized that it was bound by statutory constraints. The court also addressed the effective date of the Congressional amendment to section 6015, concluding that it did not retroactively extend the 90-day filing period for Pollock's case.

Disposition

The Tax Court dismissed Pollock's petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Significance/Impact

The decision in *Pollock v. Commissioner* underscores the importance of adhering to jurisdictional time limits in tax law, even in the face of legal uncertainty and subsequent legislative changes. It highlights the Tax Court's limited discretion to apply equitable principles to extend statutory deadlines. The ruling impacts taxpayers seeking innocent spouse relief by emphasizing the need to file petitions within the prescribed period, regardless of intervening changes in law or judicial interpretations. Subsequent cases have reinforced the principle that jurisdictional deadlines in tax law are not subject to equitable tolling, affecting how taxpayers and practitioners approach tax disputes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.