Bruce M. Kraft v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 142 T. C. No. 14 (2014)

In Bruce M. Kraft v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court upheld the IRS's decision to proceed with a levy on Kraft's personal assets to satisfy his 2009 tax liability, rather than collecting from a trust as Kraft requested. The court found no abuse of discretion in the IRS's action, emphasizing that the agency is not required to collect from a specific asset as requested by a taxpayer. This ruling underscores the IRS's broad discretion in choosing collection methods, affirming the balance between efficient tax collection and minimal intrusion.

Parties

Bruce M. Kraft, the Petitioner, filed a petition for review pursuant to I. R. C. section 6330 against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Respondent, regarding a Notice of Determination Concerning Collection Action issued for the 2009 tax year. Kraft was represented pro se and by various attorneys during the proceedings, while Whitney N. Moore represented the Commissioner.

Facts

Bruce M. Kraft filed his 2009 Federal income tax return late, reporting a tax liability of $141,045. After partial payments, the remaining balance grew due to interest and penalties. Kraft received a Final Notice of Intent to Levy for the 2009 tax year and requested a Collection Due Process (CDP) hearing, during which he proposed that the IRS levy on assets held by the Bruce Kraft Discretionary Trust (Kraft Trust) instead of his personal assets. Kraft Trust was an irrevocable trust established by Kraft, subject to District of Columbia law, which allowed the trustee to distribute income and principal for Kraft's benefit at the trustee's discretion.

Procedural History

The IRS assessed Kraft's 2009 tax liability and issued a Final Notice of Intent to Levy. Kraft timely requested a CDP hearing, which was conducted by Settlement Officer Eva Holsey. During the hearing, Kraft proposed that the IRS collect from the Kraft Trust instead of his personal assets. Holsey sustained the proposed levy action, finding it appropriate and not more intrusive than necessary. The Appeals Office upheld this determination in a notice dated January 11, 2012. Kraft then filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court for review of the CDP determination. The Commissioner moved for summary judgment, which the court granted, finding no abuse of discretion in the IRS's decision.

Issue(s)

Whether the IRS abused its discretion by deciding to proceed with a levy on Kraft's personal assets instead of collecting from the Kraft Trust to satisfy Kraft's 2009 tax liability?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

Under I. R. C. section 6331(a), the Commissioner is authorized to levy upon property or rights to property of a taxpayer who fails to pay taxes within 10 days after notice and demand. Section 6330(c)(3)(C) requires the Appeals officer to consider whether the proposed collection action balances the need for efficient tax collection with the taxpayer's concern that the action be no more intrusive than necessary. Additionally, section 6330(c)(2)(A)(iii) allows taxpayers to raise issues related to collection alternatives, including substitution of assets. The court applies an abuse of discretion standard in reviewing the IRS's administrative determinations in collection actions.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the IRS did not abuse its discretion in deciding to proceed with a levy on Kraft's personal assets instead of collecting from the Kraft Trust. The court found that the IRS's action was within the bounds of its authority and appropriately balanced the need for efficient tax collection with Kraft's concern about intrusiveness.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the IRS has broad discretion in choosing the method of collection, as supported by I. R. C. section 6331 and the Internal Revenue Manual. The court emphasized that the IRS is not required to collect from a specific asset as requested by the taxpayer, provided the chosen method is not abusive. The court also noted that the Kraft Trust's spendthrift provision did not prevent the IRS from collecting from the trust if necessary, as per District of Columbia law. However, the court found that the IRS was not obligated to investigate the Kraft Trust's assets at the CDP stage, as such inquiries occur later in the collection process. The court concluded that the IRS's decision to levy on Kraft's personal assets was not an abuse of discretion, as it balanced the need for efficient collection with Kraft's concern about intrusiveness.

Disposition

The court granted the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment, affirming the IRS's decision to proceed with the levy on Kraft's personal assets.

Significance/Impact

This case reinforces the broad discretion afforded to the IRS in choosing collection methods, emphasizing that taxpayers cannot dictate the specific assets from which the IRS must collect. It clarifies that the IRS's decision-making process at the CDP stage focuses on balancing efficiency and intrusiveness, rather than on detailed asset investigations. This ruling may impact future collection actions by affirming the IRS's flexibility in choosing collection methods, potentially affecting taxpayers'

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

strategies in negotiating collection alternatives.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.