Whistleblower 14106-10W v. Commissioner, 137 T. C. 183 (2011)

In a landmark decision, the U. S. Tax Court ruled on the balance between public access to judicial proceedings and the privacy of tax whistleblowers. The court allowed a whistleblower to proceed anonymously in a case challenging the IRS's denial of an award, citing potential economic harm and professional ostracism if the whistleblower's identity were revealed. This ruling underscores the importance of confidentiality for whistleblowers and sets a precedent for handling such cases in the future.

Parties

Whistleblower 14106-10W, the petitioner, sought review of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue's denial of a whistleblower award under section 7623(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue was the respondent in this case.

Facts

Whistleblower 14106-10W, a former senior executive of company X, filed a claim for a whistleblower award under section 7623(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, alleging that X had underpaid its taxes. The IRS investigated the claim but did not open an administrative or judicial proceeding against X, nor did it collect any additional tax based on the whistleblower's information. Consequently, the IRS denied the whistleblower's claim on the grounds that no award determination could be made under section 7623(b). The whistleblower's identity had been kept confidential during the administrative process. Fearing professional ostracism and economic harm, the whistleblower moved for a protective order to seal the record or proceed anonymously in the judicial proceeding.

Procedural History

The whistleblower filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court for review of the IRS's denial of the whistleblower award, pursuant to section 7623(b)(4). Concurrently, the whistleblower filed a motion for a protective order, requesting that the record be sealed or that the whistleblower be granted anonymity. The IRS moved for summary judgment, which the whistleblower opposed, arguing that the motion was premature due to the pending motion for a protective order and the lack of commenced discovery. The Tax Court granted summary judgment in favor of the IRS and also ruled on the motion for a protective order, allowing the whistleblower to proceed anonymously but denying the request to seal the record.

Issue(s)

Whether the Tax Court may properly render summary judgment while a motion for a protective order is pending and discovery has not commenced?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Whether the whistleblower failed to meet the threshold requirements for a whistleblower award under section 7623(b)?

Whether the potential harm from disclosing the whistleblower's identity as a confidential informant outweighs the public interest in knowing the whistleblower's identity in a case decided on summary judgment?

Whether the parties should be ordered to redact from the record the whistleblower's and X's names and any identifying information about the whistleblower and X?

Whether granting the whistleblower's request for anonymity and redacting identifying information adequately protects the whistleblower's legitimate privacy interests as a confidential informant, thereby obviating the need to seal the record?

Rule(s) of Law

The Tax Court has jurisdiction over determinations regarding whistleblower awards under section 7623(b)(4). A whistleblower award under section 7623(b)(1) is dependent upon both the initiation of an administrative or judicial action and the collection of tax proceeds. The Tax Court may grant summary judgment if there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and a decision may be rendered as a matter of law. The court has broad discretionary authority to control and seal records and files in its possession, and may permit a petitioner to proceed anonymously under certain conditions.

Holding

The Tax Court held that summary judgment may be properly rendered even though a motion for a protective order is pending and discovery has not commenced. The court further held that the whistleblower failed to meet the threshold requirements for a whistleblower award under section 7623(b), and thus granted the IRS's motion for summary judgment. The court ruled that the potential harm from disclosing the whistleblower's identity as a confidential informant outweighed the public interest in knowing the whistleblower's identity in this case decided on summary judgment, and thus granted the whistleblower's request for anonymity. The court ordered the parties to redact from the record both the whistleblower's and X's names and any identifying information about the whistleblower and X. Finally, the court held that granting the whistleblower's request for anonymity and redacting identifying information adequately protected the whistleblower's legitimate privacy interests as a confidential informant, and thus denied the whistleblower's request to seal the record.

Reasoning

The Tax Court's reasoning was multifaceted. First, it analyzed the procedural posture of the case, determining that summary judgment could be granted despite the pending motion for a protective order and the lack of commenced discovery. The

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

court relied on its rules of procedure, which allow for summary judgment at any time after the pleadings are closed, and do not require that discovery be completed before such a motion can be considered.

Second, the court examined the substantive merits of the IRS's motion for summary judgment. It concluded that the whistleblower did not meet the threshold requirements for an award under section 7623(b), as no administrative or judicial action was initiated against X and no tax proceeds were collected based on the whistleblower's information.

Third, the court conducted a detailed analysis of the whistleblower's motion for a protective order. It considered the public's interest in open court proceedings and the whistleblower's privacy interests as a confidential informant. The court balanced these interests by applying a multifactor test used by other courts to determine whether litigation should be permitted to proceed anonymously. The court concluded that the whistleblower's fears of professional ostracism and economic harm were reasonable and sufficiently severe to justify anonymity, especially given the lack of antiretaliatory provisions in section 7623.

The court also considered the social interests at stake, noting a strong social interest in protecting the identity of confidential informants. It found that the public's interest in knowing the whistleblower's identity was relatively weak in this case, as the case was decided on a threshold legal issue that did not depend on the whistleblower's identity.

Finally, the court determined that granting the whistleblower anonymity and requiring redaction of identifying information would adequately protect the whistleblower's privacy interests without the need to seal the record, thereby preserving the public's ability to follow the legal proceedings.

Disposition

The Tax Court granted the IRS's motion for summary judgment and denied the whistleblower's claim for an award. The court granted the whistleblower's request for anonymity and ordered the parties to redact from the record the whistleblower's and X's names and any identifying information about the whistleblower and X. The court denied the whistleblower's request to seal the record.

Significance/Impact

This case is significant for its impact on the treatment of whistleblower cases in the Tax Court. It establishes that whistleblowers may be allowed to proceed anonymously in certain circumstances, balancing the public's interest in open court proceedings with the whistleblower's privacy interests as a confidential informant. The decision also highlights the absence of antiretaliatory provisions in section 7623 and the potential for economic harm and professional ostracism faced by

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

whistleblowers. The ruling may encourage more whistleblowers to come forward by providing a measure of protection for their identities, but it also underscores the need for legislative action to address the privacy concerns of whistleblowers and the subjects of their claims.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.