Mannella v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 132 T. C. 196 (U. S. Tax Ct. 2009)

In Mannella v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that actual receipt of a notice of intent to levy is not required to start the two-year period for requesting relief from joint and several tax liability under IRC sections 6015(b) and (c). However, the court invalidated a regulation imposing a two-year limit on section 6015(f) relief requests, allowing Denise Mannella's claim for equitable relief to proceed despite being filed late. This decision clarifies the procedural requirements for innocent spouse relief and impacts how taxpayers may seek relief from joint tax liabilities.

Parties

Denise Mannella (Petitioner) filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent). The case was heard by Judge Harry A. Haines of the U. S. Tax Court.

Facts

Denise Mannella and her husband, Anthony J. Mannella, filed joint federal income tax returns for the years 1996 through 2000. They failed to pay the taxes due for these years, prompting the Commissioner to issue each of them a Final Notice, Notice of Intent to Levy, and Notice of Your Right to a Hearing on June 4, 2004. The notices were sent by certified mail to their correct address. Anthony Mannella received both notices and signed for them, but allegedly did not inform Denise Mannella of her notice until over two years later. On November 1, 2006, Denise Mannella filed Form 8857, requesting relief from joint and several liability under IRC section 6015 for the years in question.

Procedural History

On May 3, 2007, the Commissioner issued a Notice of Determination denying Denise Mannella's request for relief, citing that it was filed more than two years after the start of collection activity. Denise Mannella then filed a timely petition with the U. S. Tax Court seeking relief under IRC section 6015. The Commissioner moved for summary judgment, arguing that Mannella's request was untimely under sections 6015(b), (c), and (f). The court heard arguments and applied the standard of review for summary judgment, assessing whether there were genuine issues of material fact.

Issue(s)

Whether actual receipt of a notice of intent to levy is required to start the two-year period for requesting relief under IRC sections 6015(b) and (c)?

Whether the two-year limitations period set forth in 26 C. F. R. section 1.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

6015-5(b)(1) is a valid interpretation of IRC section 6015(f)?

Rule(s) of Law

IRC section 6015(b)(1)(E) and (c)(3)(B) stipulate that a request for relief must be made within two years after the Commissioner's first collection activity against the requesting spouse. The issuance of a notice of intent to levy is considered a collection activity under 26 C. F. R. section 1. 6015-5(b)(2). IRC section 6015(f) provides for equitable relief from joint and several liability without a statutory two-year limitations period, but 26 C. F. R. section 1. 6015-5(b)(1) imposes such a period. The court must apply the Chevron two-step analysis to determine the validity of agency regulations.

Holding

The court held that actual receipt of a notice of intent to levy is not required to start the two-year period for requesting relief under IRC sections 6015(b) and (c). Therefore, Denise Mannella's requests under these sections were untimely. However, the court found that 26 C. F. R. section 1. 6015-5(b)(1) is an invalid interpretation of IRC section 6015(f) under the Chevron step one analysis because Congress had directly spoken to the issue. Consequently, Mannella's request for relief under section 6015(f) was not barred by the two-year limitation.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the statutory language of IRC sections 6015(b) and (c) does not require actual receipt of the notice of intent to levy to start the two-year period. The court relied on precedents indicating that mailing to the last known address suffices to initiate statutory periods, consistent with IRC sections 6330 and 6331, which govern notices of intent to levy.

For section 6015(f), the court applied the Chevron framework. Under Chevron step one, the court found that Congress had explicitly provided for equitable relief under section 6015(f) without a time limit, directly contradicting the regulation's imposition of a two-year limit. Even if the statute were considered ambiguous (Chevron step two), the court held that a two-year limit would not be a permissible construction of section 6015(f), given its purpose to provide relief when other subsections are unavailable or inadequate.

The court also considered the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998, which mandates that taxpayers be notified of their rights, but does not require actual receipt of such notice to trigger statutory periods. The court's decision in Lantz v. Commissioner was cited to support the invalidation of the regulation.

The court addressed the Commissioner's argument that Mannella's request was untimely, finding it unavailing for section 6015(f) relief due to the invalid regulation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court did not address other potential bases for denying relief under section 6015(f), as those were not argued in the motion for summary judgment.

Disposition

The court granted the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment in part, denying Denise Mannella relief under IRC sections 6015(b) and (c) due to untimeliness. However, the motion was denied in part, allowing Mannella's request for relief under section 6015(f) to proceed.

Significance/Impact

The Mannella decision clarifies that actual receipt of a notice of intent to levy is not required to start the two-year period for requesting relief under IRC sections 6015(b) and (c), reinforcing the importance of mailing to the last known address. More significantly, the court's invalidation of 26 C. F. R. section 1. 6015-5(b)(1) broadens access to equitable relief under section 6015(f), allowing taxpayers to seek such relief without a strict two-year limitation. This ruling has practical implications for legal practitioners advising clients on innocent spouse relief, emphasizing the need to consider section 6015(f) as an alternative when other relief options are unavailable due to timing issues. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, impacting IRS procedures and taxpayer rights in seeking relief from joint tax liabilities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.