Hi-Q Pers. , Inc. v. Commissioner, 132 T. C. 279 (U. S. Tax Court 2009)

In Hi-Q Pers. , Inc. v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. was liable for unpaid employment taxes and fraud penalties for 1995-1998. The court held that Hi-Q was the statutory employer of temporary laborers paid in cash, despite not withholding taxes, and was collaterally estopped from denying tax responsibility due to its president's guilty plea. This case underscores the IRS's ability to enforce tax collection through collateral estoppel and clarifies the definition of statutory employer for employment tax purposes.

Parties

Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. (Petitioner) v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent)

Facts

Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. operated a temporary employment service, providing skilled and unskilled laborers to over 250 client companies from 1995 to 1998. Hi-Q offered laborers the option to be paid by check or cash. Laborers paid by check were included on the regular payroll and treated as employees for employment tax purposes. However, Hi-Q did not withhold federal income taxes or pay FICA taxes for those paid in cash, amounting to $14,845,019 in unreported wages. Luan Nguyen, Hi-Q's president and sole shareholder, pleaded guilty to failing to withhold and pay these taxes and to conspiracy to defraud the United States.

Procedural History

The case originated from a Notice of Determination of Worker Classification issued by the IRS, assessing Hi-Q's liabilities for employment taxes and fraud penalties. Hi-Q contested the notice, arguing that the IRS's determinations were untimely. The U. S. Tax Court reviewed the case de novo, applying the preponderance of evidence standard for tax liabilities and clear and convincing evidence for fraud penalties.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. is collaterally estopped from denying its responsibility for paying employment taxes due to its president's guilty plea?
2. Whether Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. is the statutory employer of temporary laborers under 26 U. S. C. § 3401(d)(1) and thus liable for employment taxes?
3. Whether Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. is liable for fraud penalties under 26 U. S. C. § 6663(a)?
4. Whether the IRS's determinations were timely under 26 U. S. C. § 6501(c)(1)?

Rule(s) of Law

1. *Collateral Estoppel*: Once an issue of fact or law is actually and necessarily determined by a court of competent jurisdiction, that determination is conclusive in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

subsequent suits based on a different cause of action involving a party to the prior litigation. *Monahan v. Commissioner*, 109 T. C. 235, 240 (1997).
2. *Statutory Employer*: Under 26 U. S. C. § 3401(d)(1), the employer is the person who has control of the payment of wages for services rendered, applicable to both income tax withholding and FICA taxes. *Otte v. United States*, 419 U. S. 43, 51 (1974).
3. *Fraud Penalty*: If any part of any underpayment of tax required to be shown on a return is due to fraud, there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to 75 percent of the portion of the underpayment which is attributable to fraud. 26 U. S. C. § 6663(a).
4. *Period of Limitations*: If a return is false or fraudulent with the intent to evade tax, the tax may be assessed at any time. 26 U. S. C. § 6501(c)(1).

Holding

1. Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. is collaterally estopped from denying its responsibility for paying employment taxes due to the guilty plea of its president, Luan Nguyen.
2. Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. is the statutory employer of temporary laborers under 26 U. S. C. § 3401(d)(1) and is liable for the employment taxes.
3. Hi-Q Personnel, Inc. is liable for fraud penalties under 26 U. S. C. § 6663(a).
4. The IRS's determinations were timely under 26 U. S. C. § 6501(c)(1) because Hi-Q filed false or fraudulent returns.

Reasoning

The court applied the doctrine of collateral estoppel, finding that Nguyen's guilty plea to willful failure to collect and pay employment taxes and conspiracy to defraud the U. S. met all conditions for issue preclusion against Hi-Q. Hi-Q was the statutory employer because it controlled the payment of wages to the temporary laborers, as evidenced by its contracts with clients and its payment practices. The court found clear and convincing evidence of fraud, noting Hi-Q's deliberate choice to pay laborers in cash to avoid taxes, which was part of a broader scheme to defraud the government. The filing of false Forms 941 justified the IRS's action beyond the standard three-year limitations period.

The court rejected Hi-Q's arguments that the clients were the employers, pointing out that Hi-Q controlled wage payments and was responsible for tax obligations under its contracts. The court also dismissed Hi-Q's claim that the IRS's tax calculations were arbitrary, affirming that the IRS used the same withholding rates Hi-Q applied to its check-paid employees.

Disposition

The court sustained the IRS's determinations of deficiencies in and penalties with respect to Hi-Q's employment taxes for all taxable quarters in issue.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Significance/Impact

This case reinforces the IRS's ability to use collateral estoppel to enforce tax liabilities when related criminal convictions exist. It also clarifies the statutory employer doctrine, emphasizing control over wage payment as a key factor in determining employment tax responsibilities. The decision has significant implications for businesses using temporary labor, highlighting the need for accurate reporting and withholding of employment taxes, and the severe penalties for fraud, including the extension of the statute of limitations for tax assessments.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.