Ringo v. Commissioner, 143 T. C. 297 (2014)

In Ringo v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court established that it retains jurisdiction over whistleblower award determinations once a timely petition is filed, even if the IRS later claims the determination was made in error. This ruling clarifies the court's authority under I. R. C. § 7623(b)(4), ensuring whistleblowers can seek judicial review of IRS decisions denying their claims for awards based on information provided leading to tax collections.

Parties

Mica Ringo, the Petitioner, filed a claim for a whistleblower award against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Respondent, in the United States Tax Court. Ringo was the whistleblower seeking judicial review of a determination by the IRS Whistleblower Office, while the Commissioner represented the IRS in defending the determination.

Facts

On February 17, 2011, Mica Ringo filed a Form 211, Application for Award for Original Information, with the IRS Whistleblower Office. He filed an amended Form 211 on October 6, 2011. On November 7, 2012, the Whistleblower Office mailed Ringo a letter stating he was ineligible for a whistleblower award under I. R. C. § 7623 because his information did not result in the collection of any proceeds. Ringo timely petitioned the Tax Court on December 7, 2012, invoking jurisdiction under I. R. C. § 7623(b)(4). On June 11, 2013, the Whistleblower Office sent another letter to Ringo, stating the November 7, 2012, letter was sent in error and that they were still considering his application.

Procedural History

After receiving the November 7, 2012, letter denying his eligibility for an award, Ringo filed a petition with the Tax Court on December 7, 2012, invoking jurisdiction under I. R. C. § 7623(b)(4). The Commissioner subsequently moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that the November 7, 2012, letter was not a definitive determination because the Whistleblower Office later claimed it was still considering Ringo's application. The Tax Court reviewed the motion to dismiss and ruled on the issue of jurisdiction.

Issue(s)

Whether the November 7, 2012, letter from the IRS Whistleblower Office constituted a "determination" under I. R. C. § 7623(b)(4), thereby conferring jurisdiction on the Tax Court, despite the subsequent June 11, 2013, letter stating the November 7 letter was sent in error?

Rule(s) of Law

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

I. R. C. § 7623(b)(4) states that "[a]ny determination regarding an award under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) may, within 30 days of such determination, be appealed to the Tax Court (and the Tax Court shall have jurisdiction with respect to such matter). " The court's jurisdiction is determined by the facts as they exist at the time the jurisdiction is invoked, and once jurisdiction is established, it generally continues unimpaired until the court's decision or termination by the court.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the November 7, 2012, letter was a determination under I. R. C. § 7623(b)(4), and thus, the court had jurisdiction over the matter. The court's jurisdiction was not terminated by the subsequent June 11, 2013, letter stating that the November 7 letter was sent in error.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that a determination for purposes of I. R. C. § 7623(b)(4) was made in the November 7, 2012, letter, which explicitly stated Ringo was ineligible for a whistleblower award. The court relied on precedent such as Cooper v. Commissioner, 135 T. C. 70 (2010), which held that a letter not labeled as a determination but stating the applicant was not entitled to an award and providing an explanation was sufficient to invoke the court's jurisdiction. The court also emphasized that jurisdiction depends on facts at the time it is invoked and is not affected by subsequent events or the IRS's later reconsideration of its determination. The court analogized to deficiency cases, where a notice of deficiency, even if erroneous or conceded, continues to provide a basis for jurisdiction. The court concluded that the June 11, 2013, letter did not nullify the jurisdiction already established by the timely filing of the petition in response to the November 7, 2012, letter.

Disposition

The Tax Court denied the Commissioner's motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, affirming that the court had jurisdiction over the matter based on the November 7, 2012, letter and Ringo's timely petition.

Significance/Impact

Ringo v. Commissioner clarifies the jurisdiction of the Tax Court under I. R. C. § 7623(b)(4), ensuring that whistleblowers have access to judicial review once a determination denying an award is made, regardless of the IRS's subsequent actions or reconsiderations. This ruling is significant for whistleblower law, as it solidifies the rights of whistleblowers to challenge IRS determinations and ensures the integrity of the judicial process in reviewing such claims. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, reinforcing the court's authority in whistleblower disputes and the importance of timely petitions in preserving jurisdiction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.