Sotiropoulos v. Commissioner, 142 T. C. No. 15 (2014)

In Sotiropoulos v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled it has jurisdiction to determine whether U. K. tax payments received by a U. S. citizen are “refunds” under I. R. C. § 905(c), impacting the applicability of deficiency procedures for foreign tax credit adjustments. This decision reaffirms the court’s role as a prepayment forum for taxpayers to contest IRS determinations related to foreign tax credits, despite the IRS’s attempt to bypass these procedures.

Parties

Petitioner: Panagiota Pam Sotiropoulos, a U. S. citizen who lived and worked in the U. K. during the years in question.
Respondent: Commissioner of Internal Revenue, representing the IRS.

Facts

Panagiota Pam Sotiropoulos, a U. S. citizen, resided and worked in the U. K. from 2003 to 2005. During these years, she was employed by Goldman Sachs in London, and her employer withheld U. K. income tax from her wages. Sotiropoulos claimed foreign tax credits on her U. S. tax returns corresponding to the U. K. taxes withheld. Subsequently, she filed U. K. tax returns claiming deductions from investments in U. K. film partnerships, resulting in overpayments of U. K. tax. She applied for refunds of these overpayments and received payments from U. K. taxing authorities. However, she argued that these payments were not “refunds” under I. R. C. § 905(c)(1)(C) because her entitlement to refunds was still under investigation by U. K. authorities and possibly affected by the U. S. /U. K. income tax treaty. Consequently, she did not notify the IRS of these payments as required by I. R. C. § 905(c)(1).

Procedural History

Following an audit, the IRS determined that Sotiropoulos had received U. K. tax refunds and disallowed corresponding foreign tax credits on her U. S. returns for 2003-2005. The IRS issued a notice of deficiency, which Sotiropoulos contested by timely petitioning the U. S. Tax Court. Approximately a year after filing his answer, the Commissioner moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction, asserting that I. R. C. § 905(c) authorized the IRS to redetermine her tax and collect it upon notice and demand, thus bypassing deficiency procedures.

Issue(s)

Whether the U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction to determine if the payments received by Sotiropoulos from U. K. taxing authorities constitute “refunds” within the meaning of I. R. C. § 905(c)(1)(C), thereby affecting the applicability of deficiency procedures?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

I. R. C. § 905(c)(1) requires a taxpayer to notify the Secretary if a foreign tax claimed as a credit is "refunded in whole or in part. " The Secretary may then redetermine the U. S. tax for the affected year, and any additional tax due is collectible upon notice and demand per I. R. C. § 905(c)(3). I. R. C. § 6213(h)(2)(A) excludes foreign tax credit adjustments under § 905(c) from deficiency procedures.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction to determine whether the statutory provision alleged to divest it of jurisdiction applies, specifically whether the U. K. taxes paid by Sotiropoulos have been "refunded in whole or in part" within the meaning of I. R. C. § 905(c)(1)(C).

Reasoning

The court reasoned that its jurisdiction to determine its jurisdiction is inherent and necessary to resolve disputes over the application of I. R. C. § 905(c). The court emphasized that Sotiropoulos contested the characterization of the U. K. payments as "refunds," which is a prerequisite for the application of § 905(c)(1)(C). The court cited precedent where similar disputes over foreign tax credit adjustments were adjudicated under deficiency procedures, underscoring the importance of providing taxpayers a prepayment forum to contest disputed taxes. The court distinguished the case from situations where taxes are uncontested or arise from obvious errors, where summary assessment is permitted. The court's jurisdiction to determine the nature of the U. K. payments ensures that taxpayers have an opportunity to contest IRS determinations before assessment, aligning with the statutory scheme's intent.

Disposition

The court denied the Commissioner's motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, affirming its authority to decide whether the U. K. payments constituted "refunds" under I. R. C. § 905(c)(1)(C).

Significance/Impact

This decision reinforces the U. S. Tax Court's role as a prepayment forum for taxpayers contesting foreign tax credit adjustments. It clarifies that the court retains jurisdiction to determine the applicability of I. R. C. § 905(c) when the characterization of foreign tax payments is disputed. The ruling has practical implications for taxpayers and the IRS in handling foreign tax credit disputes, ensuring that taxpayers have a venue to challenge IRS determinations before tax assessments are made. The case also highlights the interplay between domestic tax laws and international tax treaties, affecting how foreign tax credits are administered and contested.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.