Sotiropoulos v. Commissioner, 142 T. C. 269 (2014)

In Sotiropoulos v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court asserted its jurisdiction to determine if a statutory provision divesting it of jurisdiction applied, specifically whether U. K. taxes claimed as credits were 'refunded' under I. R. C. § 905(c). The case, pivotal for taxpayers contesting foreign tax credit adjustments, underscores the court's role as a prepayment forum, allowing disputes over the application of § 905(c) to be resolved before tax collection.

Parties

Petitioner: Panagiota Pam Sotiropoulos, a U. S. citizen residing and working in the U. K. , initially filed her case in the U. S. Tax Court as a petitioner. Respondent: Commissioner of Internal Revenue, representing the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), was the respondent at the trial and appeal levels.

Facts

Panagiota Pam Sotiropoulos, a U. S. citizen, was employed by Goldman Sachs in London from 2003 to 2005. During this period, her employer withheld U. K. income tax from her wages. Sotiropoulos filed U. S. and U. K. income tax returns for each year, claiming foreign tax credits on her U. S. returns equivalent to the U. K. tax withheld. She also invested in U. K. film partnerships and claimed substantial deductions on her U. K. returns, leading to requests for refunds of the withheld U. K. taxes. Sotiropoulos received payments from U. K. taxing authorities but argued these were not 'refunds' within the meaning of I. R. C. § 905(c)(1)(C) due to ongoing investigations into her entitlement and potential implications of the U. S. /U. K. income tax treaty. She did not notify the IRS of these payments as required by § 905(c)(1). Following an IRS examination, the agency determined that Sotiropoulos had received U. K. tax refunds and disallowed corresponding foreign tax credits on her U. S. returns, leading to a notice of deficiency.

Procedural History

After receiving the notice of deficiency, Sotiropoulos timely petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for redetermination of the deficiencies for tax years 2003-2005. Approximately a year after filing his answer, the Commissioner moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that the notice of deficiency was erroneously issued because § 905(c) authorizes the IRS to redetermine and collect the tax upon notice and demand, bypassing deficiency procedures. The Commissioner conceded the accuracy-related penalties but maintained that foreign tax credit adjustments were removed from deficiency procedures by § 6213(h)(2)(A) cross-referencing to § 905(c).

Issue(s)

Whether the U. S. Tax Court has jurisdiction to determine if the U. K. taxes paid by

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the petitioner have been ‘refunded in whole or in part’ within the meaning of I. R. C. § 905(c)(1)(C)?

Rule(s) of Law

I. R. C. § 901(a) allows a U. S. citizen to claim a credit for income taxes paid to a foreign country. I. R. C. § 905(c)(1) requires a taxpayer to notify the Secretary if a claimed foreign tax is ‘refunded in whole or in part,’ allowing the IRS to redetermine the U. S. tax for the affected years. I. R. C. § 905(c)(3) permits the IRS to collect any additional tax due upon notice and demand. I. R. C. § 6213(h)(2)(A) exempts § 905(c) adjustments from the usual deficiency procedures.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that it has jurisdiction to determine whether the U. K. taxes paid by the petitioner have been ‘refunded in whole or in part’ within the meaning of I. R. C. § 905(c)(1)(C), thus denying the Commissioner’s motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that it always has jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction. It emphasized that the statutory framework of the Internal Revenue Code generally provides taxpayers a prepayment forum to contest disputed taxes, with limited exceptions allowing summary assessment. The court noted that § 905(c) adjustments are only applicable if a foreign tax is ‘refunded,’ and since Sotiropoulos disputed this, the court had to determine whether the statutory provision alleged to divest it of jurisdiction applied. The court distinguished this from situations where taxpayers concede receipt of a foreign tax refund by self-reporting, and highlighted previous cases where the Tax Court had jurisdiction over similar disputes under § 905(c) and its predecessors. The court applied a broad, practical construction of its jurisdictional provisions, rejecting a narrow, technical interpretation that would limit its ability to review disputes over § 905(c) adjustments. It also considered the policy of providing taxpayers a prepayment forum to resolve disputes, which supported its decision to retain jurisdiction.

Disposition

The court issued an order denying the Commissioner’s motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

Significance/Impact

Sotiropoulos v. Commissioner is significant as it clarifies that the U. S. Tax Court retains jurisdiction to adjudicate whether a foreign tax credit adjustment under § 905(c) is warranted, particularly when the taxpayer disputes the ‘refund’ status of foreign taxes. This ruling reaffirms the court’s role as a prepayment forum, ensuring

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

taxpayers have an opportunity to challenge IRS determinations before assessment and collection of additional taxes. The decision also sets a precedent for handling similar disputes, emphasizing the court's broad jurisdictional authority and the importance of judicial review in tax disputes involving foreign tax credits. Subsequent courts have followed this precedent, ensuring taxpayers' rights to contest § 905(c) adjustments are preserved.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.