Onyango v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 142 T. C. 425 (U. S. Tax Court 2014)

In Onyango v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that a taxpayer cannot decline to retrieve their mail and later claim they did not receive a notice of deficiency, thus precluding them from disputing their tax liability in a Collection Due Process (CDP) hearing. The court emphasized the importance of taxpayers actively engaging with IRS communications, particularly when they have the ability and opportunity to do so. This decision clarifies the responsibilities of taxpayers in the context of IRS collection actions and the procedural requirements for challenging tax liabilities.

Parties

Eric Onyango, the petitioner, represented himself pro se throughout the proceedings. The respondent was the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, represented by Lauren N. May and K. Elizabeth Kelly.

Facts

Eric Onyango timely filed his tax return for the taxable year 2006, reporting a total tax of $1,606. Subsequently, he filed an amended return on September 23, 2008, increasing his tax liability to $3,774, which the IRS processed. After an examination, the IRS proposed adjustments and attempted to schedule a meeting with Onyango, which he did not attend. On August 6, 2010, the IRS mailed a notice of deficiency for Onyango's 2006 and 2007 tax years to his legal residence at 222 North Columbus Drive, No. 1507, Chicago, Illinois. Despite multiple attempts by the U. S. Postal Service to deliver this notice, Onyango did not retrieve it. He spent approximately 30 to 40% of the period from August to December 2010 at his residence but did not regularly check his mailbox. Onyango later claimed he did not receive the notice of deficiency, asserting his right to challenge his tax liability in a CDP hearing.

Procedural History

Onyango filed petitions in response to IRS notices of determination concerning collection actions under I. R. C. sections 6320 and 6330, dated November 3, 2011, and June 25, 2012, respectively, related to his 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 tax years. The Tax Court conducted a partial trial to determine whether Onyango could dispute his 2006 tax liability under I. R. C. section 6330(c)(2)(B), focusing on whether he received the notice of deficiency. The court found that Onyango had multiple opportunities to retrieve the notice but declined to do so, thus upholding the IRS's determinations.

Issue(s)

Whether a taxpayer, who declines to retrieve his mail despite having multiple opportunities to do so, can successfully contend that he did not receive a notice of deficiency for purposes of I. R. C. section 6330(c)(2)(B), thereby allowing him to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

dispute the underlying tax liability in a Collection Due Process hearing.

Rule(s) of Law

I. R. C. section 6330(c)(2)(B) allows a person to dispute the underlying tax liability if the person did not receive a statutory notice of deficiency or did not otherwise have an opportunity to dispute such tax liability. The court must consider whether the taxpayer's actions constituted a reasonable effort to receive the notice.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that Onyango could not decline to retrieve his mail when he was reasonably able and had multiple opportunities to do so, and thereafter contend that he did not receive the notice of deficiency for purposes of I. R. C. section 6330(c)(2)(B). Consequently, he was not entitled to dispute the underlying tax liability for his 2006 tax year in a CDP hearing.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that Onyango's failure to regularly check his mailbox, despite spending significant time at his legal residence and knowing that the IRS was examining his tax years, demonstrated a lack of diligence in receiving important tax-related communications. The court emphasized that a taxpayer cannot willfully ignore or avoid receiving notices and later claim non-receipt to challenge tax liabilities. The court rejected Onyango's contention that he did not receive the notice within the 90-day period to file a petition, citing his own testimony about not regularly checking his mail. The court also considered policy implications, noting that allowing taxpayers to avoid receiving notices would undermine the effectiveness of the IRS's collection process and the integrity of the tax system.

Disposition

The Tax Court entered decisions in favor of the respondent, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, sustaining the notices of determination concerning collection actions under I. R. C. sections 6320 and 6330.

Significance/Impact

Onyango v. Comm'r reinforces the principle that taxpayers have a responsibility to actively engage with IRS communications, particularly when they have the means and opportunity to do so. This decision impacts the procedural aspect of IRS collection actions, clarifying that taxpayers cannot claim non-receipt of notices if they fail to retrieve their mail. It sets a precedent for future cases involving the receipt of notices of deficiency and the ability to challenge underlying tax liabilities in CDP hearings. The ruling underscores the importance of due diligence on the part of taxpayers in managing their tax affairs and responding to IRS inquiries.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.