DelPonte v. Commissioner, 158 T. C. No. 7 (2022)

In a landmark ruling, the U. S. Tax Court clarified that the IRS Chief Counsel has the authority to accept or reject innocent spouse relief determinations made by the Cincinnati Centralized Innocent Spouse Operation (CCISO) when such claims are raised as affirmative defenses in deficiency proceedings. This decision reaffirms the Chief Counsel's discretion in litigation matters, impacting how innocent spouse relief is handled in Tax Court cases.

Parties

Michelle DelPonte, the petitioner, sought innocent spouse relief from joint tax liabilities with her former husband, William Goddard. The respondent was the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. DelPonte was the petitioner throughout the proceedings in the Tax Court, while the Commissioner defended the IRS's position.

Facts

Michelle DelPonte and William Goddard, who were married, filed joint tax returns for the years 1999, 2000, and 2001. During their marriage, Goddard, a lawyer, engaged in aggressive tax-avoidance schemes, resulting in significant tax deficiencies assessed by the IRS. DelPonte, unaware of these schemes and the subsequent notices of deficiency, was jointly and severally liable for the taxes due to the joint filing status. After their separation, Goddard filed petitions on DelPonte's behalf, asserting innocent spouse relief under I. R. C. § 6015(c). DelPonte only became aware of these proceedings in 2010 and subsequently sought relief from the IRS. The Cincinnati Centralized Innocent Spouse Operation (CCISO) concluded that DelPonte was entitled to relief, but the IRS's Chief Counsel sought further information before making a final determination. DelPonte then moved for entry of decision, arguing that CCISO's determination should be final.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency to Goddard's law firm, which were not communicated to DelPonte. Goddard filed petitions asserting innocent spouse relief on DelPonte's behalf without her knowledge. DelPonte, upon learning of the proceedings in 2010, ratified the petitions and sought innocent spouse relief. The Chief Counsel referred her request to CCISO, which determined she was entitled to relief but did not issue a final determination letter. Instead, CCISO communicated its findings to the Chief Counsel, who requested additional information. DelPonte moved for entry of decision based on CCISO's determination. The Tax Court denied her motion, affirming the Chief Counsel's authority to decide on the matter.

Issue(s)

Whether the IRS Chief Counsel has the authority to accept or reject a determination by the Cincinnati Centralized Innocent Spouse Operation (CCISO) regarding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

innocent spouse relief when such relief is raised as an affirmative defense in a deficiency proceeding in the Tax Court?

Rule(s) of Law

The authority of the Chief Counsel to represent the IRS in Tax Court cases is derived from I. R. C. § 7803(b)(2)(D), which delegates such duties to the Chief Counsel as prescribed by the Secretary, including representation in Tax Court. General Counsel Order No. 4 further delegates to the Chief Counsel the authority to decide whether and how to defend, prosecute, settle, or abandon claims or defenses in Tax Court cases. I. R. C. § 6015 provides for innocent spouse relief, allowing a spouse to seek relief from joint and several liability under certain conditions.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the Chief Counsel has the final authority to accept or reject CCISO's determination of innocent spouse relief when such relief is raised as an affirmative defense in a deficiency proceeding. The court affirmed that the Chief Counsel's discretion in litigation matters extends to deciding whether to adopt CCISO's recommendations.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning was rooted in the statutory and regulatory framework governing the IRS and Tax Court proceedings. The court emphasized that the Chief Counsel's role in representing the IRS in Tax Court cases, as per I. R. C. § 7803(b)(2)(D) and General Counsel Order No. 4, includes the discretion to settle or litigate issues raised in deficiency proceedings. The court rejected DelPonte's argument that CCISO's determination should be binding, noting that CCISO's role is advisory in deficiency cases. The court also addressed DelPonte's fairness arguments, stating that the statutory scheme does not allow for altering the Chief Counsel's authority in the name of equity. The court further clarified that the Chief Counsel's guidance to attorneys, as seen in various notices, consistently used advisory language ('should' rather than 'must') when referring to CCISO's determinations, reinforcing the discretionary nature of the Chief Counsel's authority. The court also noted the procedural differences between deficiency cases and other avenues for seeking innocent spouse relief, such as stand-alone petitions or collection due process (CDP) hearings, and found that these differences did not justify altering the Chief Counsel's authority.

Disposition

The Tax Court denied DelPonte's motion for entry of decision, affirming that the Chief Counsel retains the authority to decide whether to accept or reject CCISO's determination of innocent spouse relief in deficiency proceedings.

Significance/Impact

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

This decision clarifies the division of authority within the IRS regarding innocent spouse relief claims raised in deficiency proceedings. It reinforces the Chief Counsel's role in litigation and decision-making in Tax Court cases, potentially affecting how taxpayers and their legal representatives approach such claims. The ruling may lead to more consistent handling of innocent spouse relief claims across different types of proceedings, ensuring that the Chief Counsel's discretion is respected in deficiency cases. However, it also highlights the challenges faced by spouses who seek relief after being unaware of their joint liabilities, prompting potential future legislative or regulatory changes to address these issues more equitably.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.