Settles v. Commissioner, 138 T. C. 372, 2012 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 20, 138 T. C. No. 19 (U. S. Tax Court 2012)

In Settles v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that the automatic stay imposed by a debtor's bankruptcy filing does not bar the dismissal of a Tax Court case upon the debtor's motion. Thomas Edward Settles, who challenged his federal tax liabilities in the Tax Court, had his case stayed due to his bankruptcy filing. Despite the ongoing bankruptcy, Settles moved to dismiss his Tax Court petitions, and the court granted the motion, clarifying that such dismissal does not contravene the automatic stay under 11 U. S. C. § 362(a)(8). This decision underscores the court's authority to manage its docket efficiently, even amidst bankruptcy proceedings.

Parties

Thomas Edward Settles, the petitioner, filed the petitions pro se. The respondent was the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, represented by Shawna A. Early.

Facts

Thomas Edward Settles filed petitions in the U. S. Tax Court on June 1, 2009, challenging his underlying federal income tax liabilities for the tax years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. At the time of filing, Settles resided in Tennessee. On September 25, 2009, Settles filed a Chapter 11 bankruptcy petition in the U. S. Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. As a result, on October 29, 2009, the Tax Court issued orders staying the proceedings pursuant to 11 U. S. C. § 362(a)(8). On April 9, 2010, Settles filed an adversary proceeding against the Commissioner in the bankruptcy court under 11 U. S. C. § 505(a), seeking a declaratory judgment regarding his tax liabilities. On June 10, 2011, the bankruptcy court granted the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment, ruling that Settles was estopped from challenging the tax liabilities in question. Despite the ongoing bankruptcy, Settles moved to dismiss his Tax Court petitions on July 11, 2011, which the Commissioner did not oppose.

Procedural History

Settles filed petitions in the U. S. Tax Court on June 1, 2009, challenging his tax liabilities. Following his Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing on September 25, 2009, the Tax Court proceedings were automatically stayed on October 29, 2009, under 11 U. S. C. § 362(a)(8). Settles then initiated an adversary proceeding in the bankruptcy court on April 9, 2010, which resulted in a summary judgment against him on June 10, 2011. On July 11, 2011, Settles moved to dismiss his Tax Court petitions, and these motions were filed by the court on September 15, 2011. The Commissioner did not object to the dismissal, and the Tax Court granted the motions, issuing orders of dismissal.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Issue(s)

Whether the automatic stay under 11 U. S. C. § 362(a)(8), which arises from a debtor's bankruptcy filing and has not been vacated or lifted, prevents the U. S. Tax Court from granting a debtor's motion to dismiss a petition filed under I. R. C. § 6330(d)?

Rule(s) of Law

The automatic stay under 11 U. S. C. § 362(a)(8) applies to the "commencement or continuation of a proceeding before the United States Tax Court concerning a tax liability of a debtor. " The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, specifically Rule 41(a)(2), allow for voluntary dismissal of an action by the plaintiff with the court's approval, provided that the dismissal does not prejudice the nonmovant.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the automatic stay under 11 U. S. C. § 362(a)(8) does not prevent the court from granting Settles' motions to dismiss his petitions filed under I. R. C. § 6330(d) for review of collection actions.

Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the automatic stay under 11 U. S. C. § 362(a)(8) only prohibits the "commencement or continuation" of a proceeding, not its dismissal. The court drew guidance from other judicial decisions that have addressed similar issues under 11 U. S. C. § 362(a)(1), which stays proceedings against a debtor. These decisions established that dismissing a case does not constitute a continuation of the proceeding if it does not require the court to consider issues related to the underlying case. The court further noted that the purpose of the automatic stay—to provide the debtor breathing room and to protect creditors from preferential treatment—would not be undermined by dismissing the Tax Court petitions, as the bankruptcy court had already adjudicated Settles' tax liabilities. Additionally, the Tax Court distinguished between petitions filed for deficiency redetermination, which cannot be withdrawn, and those filed for collection review, which can be dismissed upon the taxpayer's motion as per *Wagner v. Commissioner*, 118 T. C. 330 (2002). The court concluded that dismissing Settles' petitions would serve judicial economy and align with the dual purpose of the automatic stay.

Disposition

The U. S. Tax Court granted Settles' motions to dismiss his petitions and issued appropriate orders of dismissal.

Significance/Impact

The decision in *Settles v. Commissioner* clarifies the scope of the automatic stay in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the context of Tax Court proceedings. It affirms that the Tax Court retains the authority to dismiss cases upon a debtor's motion, even when a bankruptcy stay is in effect, provided that such dismissal does not require consideration of the underlying tax liability. This ruling enhances judicial efficiency by allowing the Tax Court to manage its docket without unnecessary delays caused by parallel bankruptcy proceedings. Moreover, it reinforces the distinction between deficiency cases and collection review cases in terms of dismissals, potentially impacting how taxpayers and their legal representatives approach Tax Court litigation strategies in conjunction with bankruptcy filings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.