Greenoak Holdings Ltd. v. Commissioner, 143 T. C. 8 (2014)

In Greenoak Holdings Ltd. v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled it lacked jurisdiction over a petition filed by entities asserting ownership interests in property potentially subject to levy, clarifying that only the taxpayer liable for the unpaid tax has standing to appeal under I. R. C. § 6330. The decision reinforces the statutory framework designed to protect taxpayers, not third parties, during IRS collection actions, and underscores the exclusive remedy of wrongful levy actions for third parties under I. R. C. § 7426.

Parties

Greenoak Holdings Limited, Southbrook Properties Limited, and Westlyn Properties Limited, collectively referred to as Petitioners, appealed to the U. S. Tax Court against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Respondent. The petitioners were represented by Michael Ben-Jacob, and the respondent by Frederick C. Mutter.

Facts

James B. Irwin died on September 21, 2009, and his estate failed to timely pay reported estate taxes. Howard L. Crown, the estate's personal representative, requested a Collection Due Process (CDP) hearing after receiving a notice of intent to levy from the IRS. The IRS Appeals officer sustained the levy on the estate's nonprobate assets, which included the Karamia Settlement, an offshore trust that owned the petitioners. The petitioners, asserting ownership interests in the trust's assets, filed a petition with the Tax Court, despite the estate not filing a petition.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of determination to the estate's personal representative on May 1, 2013, sustaining the proposed levy on nonprobate assets. The petitioners filed a petition with the Tax Court on May 30, 2013, without a petition from the estate. The respondent moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that the petitioners were not the proper parties to appeal the notice of determination issued to the estate. The Tax Court issued an order to show cause why the estate should not be substituted as petitioner, and after further submissions, the court considered the jurisdictional issue.

Issue(s)

Whether entities claiming ownership interests in property potentially subject to levy by the IRS have the right to appeal a notice of determination issued to the taxpayer under I. R. C. § 6330?

Rule(s) of Law

I. R. C. § 6330 provides taxpayers with procedural protections before the IRS can

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

levy property to collect unpaid taxes. The section mandates prelevy notice to the taxpayer and allows for a CDP hearing to challenge the levy. I. R. C. § 6330(d) grants jurisdiction to the Tax Court to review a notice of determination issued to the taxpayer. I. R. C. § 7426(a)(1) provides the exclusive remedy for third parties claiming wrongful levy by the IRS.

Holding

The Tax Court held that it lacked jurisdiction over the petition filed by the petitioners because they were not the taxpayers liable for the unpaid estate tax, and thus not entitled to appeal the notice of determination issued to the estate under I. R. C. § 6330(d).

Reasoning

The court's reasoning hinged on the interpretation of the term "person" in I. R. C. § 6330, which it determined unambiguously refers to the taxpayer liable for the unpaid tax. The court analyzed the statutory language, legislative history, and regulations to conclude that only the taxpayer, not third parties with alleged ownership interests in property subject to levy, is entitled to prelevy notice, a CDP hearing, and judicial review. The court rejected the petitioners' argument that they were "persons" under the statute, emphasizing that the IRS is authorized to levy only on the property of the taxpayer. The court also noted that third parties have the right to bring a wrongful levy action under I. R. C. § 7426(a)(1), but such actions fall under the jurisdiction of district courts, not the Tax Court. The court considered the legislative intent to provide due process protections to taxpayers, not to extend such rights to third parties. Additionally, the court addressed the change in the estate's representation, finding that the new personal representative's attempt to substitute the estate as petitioner was untimely and could not confer jurisdiction.

Disposition

The Tax Court dismissed the petition for lack of jurisdiction under I. R. C. § 6330(d).

Significance/Impact

The decision in Greenoak Holdings Ltd. v. Commissioner clarifies the scope of the Tax Court's jurisdiction in CDP appeals, reinforcing that only the taxpayer liable for the tax has standing to appeal a notice of determination. This ruling underscores the distinction between the rights of taxpayers and those of third parties in IRS collection actions, directing third parties to pursue wrongful levy actions under I. R. C. § 7426. The decision impacts legal practice by limiting the avenues through which third parties can challenge IRS levies, emphasizing the need for taxpayers to actively engage in the CDP process to protect their rights.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.