Lamas v. Commissioner, 137 T. C. 234 (2011)

In Lamas v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court invalidated a two-year limitations period set by IRS regulations for seeking equitable relief from joint tax liability under IRC § 6015(f). The court held that the regulation was inconsistent with the statute, which did not impose a time limit for such relief. This decision significantly impacts taxpayers seeking relief from joint tax liabilities, affirming broader access to equitable remedies without the constraint of a strict filing deadline.

Parties

Petitioner: Maria Lamas, seeking relief from joint tax liability under IRC § 6015(f). Respondent: Commissioner of Internal Revenue, denying relief based on the two-year limitations period in the regulation.

Facts

Maria Lamas and her husband, Dr. Richard M. Chentnik, filed a joint federal income tax return for 1999. Following Dr. Chentnik's conviction for Medicare fraud and subsequent imprisonment, the IRS determined an understatement of their joint tax liability for 1999 and assessed additional tax, penalties, and interest. In 2003, the IRS notified Lamas of a proposed levy action to collect the joint liability. Dr. Chentnik communicated with the IRS on behalf of Lamas, and the IRS placed the joint account into currently noncollectible status. After Dr. Chentnik's death in 2004, Lamas filed Form 8857, Request for Innocent Spouse Relief, in June 2006, more than two years after the IRS's collection action. The IRS denied her request as untimely under section 1. 6015-5(b)(1), Income Tax Regs. , which imposes a two-year limitations period for requesting relief under IRC § 6015(f).

Procedural History

Lamas filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's denial of her request for equitable relief under IRC § 6015(f). The IRS had denied Lamas's request solely on the basis of the two-year limitations period set forth in section 1. 6015-5(b)(1), Income Tax Regs. The Tax Court, applying the Chevron standard of review, examined the validity of the regulation in question.

Issue(s)

Whether the two-year limitations period set forth in section 1. 6015-5(b)(1), Income Tax Regs. , for requesting equitable relief under IRC § 6015(f) is a valid interpretation of the statute?

Rule(s) of Law

IRC § 6015(f) provides that the Secretary may relieve an individual of joint and several tax liability if, taking into account all the facts and circumstances, it is

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

inequitable to hold the individual liable, and relief is not available under subsections (b) or (c). The statute does not impose a time limit for requesting relief under subsection (f). Under the Chevron framework, a court must first determine if Congress has directly spoken to the precise question at issue; if the statute is silent or ambiguous, the court then determines whether the agency's interpretation is a permissible construction of the statute.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the two-year limitations period in section 1. 6015-5(b)(1), Income Tax Regs. , is an invalid interpretation of IRC § 6015(f). The court found that Congress's omission of a time limit in subsection (f), in contrast to the explicit two-year limit in subsections (b) and (c), indicated a clear intent to allow broader access to equitable relief without such a constraint.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning focused on statutory construction and the Chevron framework. It determined that Congress's silence on a limitations period in IRC § 6015(f) was intentional, given the explicit time limits in subsections (b) and (c). The court emphasized that the equitable relief under subsection (f) was meant to be broader than the relief under subsections (b) and (c), and imposing a two-year limit would undermine this broader purpose. The court also distinguished the case from Swallows Holding, Ltd. v. Commissioner, noting that the nature of the relief and the statutory context in Lamas were fundamentally different. Furthermore, the court drew analogies to cases involving the Bureau of Prisons, where categorical rules were found to conflict with statutory mandates to consider all relevant factors. The court concluded that the regulation failed both prongs of the Chevron test: it was contrary to the unambiguous intent of Congress, and even if the statute were considered ambiguous, the regulation was not a permissible construction.

Disposition

The Tax Court invalidated section 1. 6015-5(b)(1), Income Tax Regs. , and remanded the case for further proceedings to determine Lamas's 1999 tax liability under IRC § 6015(f), considering all facts and circumstances without the two-year limitations period.

Significance/Impact

Lamas v. Commissioner is significant for expanding the availability of equitable relief under IRC § 6015(f) by removing the two-year limitations period imposed by IRS regulations. This decision underscores the importance of statutory construction and the limits of agency authority under the Chevron doctrine. It has practical implications for taxpayers seeking relief from joint tax liabilities, particularly those who may have been unaware of their rights or unable to file within the two-year

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

period due to various personal circumstances. Subsequent courts and practitioners must consider this ruling when addressing similar issues under IRC § 6015(f), and it may influence future regulatory interpretations by the IRS.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.