Pough v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 135 T. C. 344 (2010)

In Pough v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court upheld the IRS's decision to sustain a tax lien and proposed levy against Robert Fitzgerald Pough for unpaid taxes and penalties. Pough failed to challenge his liabilities or provide necessary documentation within the deadlines set by the IRS Appeals officer. The court ruled that the Appeals officer did not abuse her discretion, emphasizing the importance of timely compliance with IRS requests in collection proceedings. This decision underscores the stringent requirements taxpayers must meet when contesting IRS collection actions.

Parties

Robert Fitzgerald Pough, the petitioner, represented himself pro se in this case. The respondent was the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, represented by Anne M. Craig.

Facts

Robert Fitzgerald Pough was the president of 911 Direct, Inc. , a company selling, installing, and servicing equipment for police and fire dispatchers. 911 Direct was delinquent in paying trust fund taxes for the quarters ending March 31, June 30, and September 30, 2006. Pough met with an IRS revenue officer on December 6, 2006, and subsequently agreed to assessments against him of section 6672 penalties for the unpaid trust fund taxes of 911 Direct by signing Form 2751. Pough also filed delinquent income tax returns for 2002 through 2005, each showing a balance due. The IRS issued notices of intent to levy and notices of federal tax lien filing for these liabilities. Pough requested hearings, which were conducted by an IRS Appeals officer. Pough failed to submit amended income tax returns, failed to provide verification of compliance with federal tax deposit obligations, and missed multiple deadlines set by the Appeals officer for providing requested documentation.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of intent to levy and notices of federal tax lien filing for Pough's 2002 through 2005 income tax liabilities and for the trust fund recovery penalties (TFRPs) for 911 Direct's unpaid trust fund taxes for the quarters ending March 31, June 30, and September 30, 2006. Pough timely requested hearings in response to these notices. An IRS Appeals officer conducted the hearings and determined that Pough had not challenged the underlying liabilities, nor had he complied with the deadlines for submitting requested documentation. The Appeals officer issued a notice of determination on August 23, 2007, sustaining the proposed levy and notices of federal tax lien. Pough timely filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court under sections 6320(c) and 6330(d) seeking review of the collection action. The Tax Court, applying an abuse of discretion standard of review, held a trial on March 8 and 9, 2010.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Issue(s)

Whether the IRS Appeals officer abused her discretion in determining to sustain the tax lien and the proposed levy against Robert Fitzgerald Pough?

Rule(s) of Law

The court applied sections 6321, 6322, 6320, and 6330 of the Internal Revenue Code, which govern the imposition of federal tax liens, the procedures for filing notices of lien, and the requirements for hearings on collection actions. Under section 6330(c)(2)(B), a taxpayer may challenge the existence or amount of the underlying tax liability if the taxpayer did not receive a notice of deficiency or otherwise have an opportunity to dispute such tax liability. The standard of review for the Commissioner's determination, when the underlying tax liability is not in dispute, is abuse of discretion. The court relied on precedents such as Giamelli v. Commissioner, 129 T. C. 107 (2007), which established that the taxpayer must prove the Commissioner's decision was arbitrary, capricious, or without sound basis in fact or law to establish an abuse of discretion.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the IRS Appeals officer did not abuse her discretion in sustaining the tax lien and the proposed levy against Robert Fitzgerald Pough. The court found that Pough had not properly challenged his underlying tax liabilities and had failed to comply with the deadlines set by the Appeals officer for submitting requested documentation.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning focused on the fact that Pough had previously agreed to the assessments of section 6672 penalties and had not timely challenged his income tax liabilities by filing amended returns. The court noted that Pough had been given adequate time by the Appeals officer to submit requested items, such as amended income tax returns and verification of compliance with federal tax deposit obligations, but had failed to do so. The court also considered Pough's failure to meet multiple deadlines and his inability to provide concrete proposals for collection alternatives, such as an installment agreement or an offer-in-compromise. The court applied the abuse of discretion standard of review, as established in Giamelli v. Commissioner, and found that Pough had not met his burden of proving that the Appeals officer's decision was arbitrary, capricious, or without sound basis in fact or law. The court emphasized the importance of timely compliance with IRS requests in collection proceedings and found that the Appeals officer had appropriately balanced the need for efficient collection of taxes with the taxpayer's concerns.

Disposition

The U. S. Tax Court entered a decision in favor of the respondent, the Commissioner

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

of Internal Revenue, sustaining the tax lien and the proposed levy against Robert Fitzgerald Pough.

Significance/Impact

Pough v. Comm’r underscores the importance of timely compliance with IRS requests in collection proceedings. The case illustrates that taxpayers must challenge underlying tax liabilities and provide requested documentation within the deadlines set by the IRS Appeals officer to avoid sustaining tax liens and levies. The decision reinforces the abuse of discretion standard of review in tax collection cases and highlights the limited opportunities for taxpayers to contest IRS collection actions after missing deadlines. This case has been cited in subsequent Tax Court decisions involving similar issues of abuse of discretion in tax collection proceedings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.