

## ***Dodson v. Commissioner, 162 T. C. No. 1 (U. S. Tax Ct. 2024)***

In *Dodson v. Commissioner*, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that a petition filed within the deadline specified in an initial notice of deficiency was timely, despite a subsequent corrected notice specifying an earlier deadline. The decision underscores the enforceability of the last sentence of I. R. C. § 6213(a), ensuring taxpayers can rely on the IRS's specified petition filing date, even if later corrected. This ruling clarifies taxpayer rights and IRS obligations in deficiency proceedings.

### **Parties**

Douglas Dodson and Rebecca Dodson, Petitioners, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent. Petitioners were the taxpayers challenging the notice of deficiency, while the Respondent was the Commissioner of Internal Revenue asserting the deficiency.

### **Facts**

On October 7, 2021, the Commissioner mailed a notice of deficiency (first notice) to Douglas and Rebecca Dodson for their 2017 taxable year, specifying December 5, 2022, as the last day to file a petition. The following day, October 8, 2021, the Commissioner mailed a second notice of deficiency (second notice) purporting to correct the first notice, specifying January 6, 2022, as the new deadline. The Dodsons filed their petition on March 3, 2022, which was within the deadline specified in the first notice but after the deadline in the second notice and the 90-day period from the mailing of the first notice.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction on June 29, 2023, arguing that the Dodsons' petition was untimely under I. R. C. § 6213(a). The Dodsons contended that their petition was timely under the last sentence of § 6213(a), which allows a petition to be treated as timely if filed on or before the last date specified in the notice of deficiency. The Tax Court considered the issue of jurisdiction and the applicability of § 6213(a).

### **Issue(s)**

Whether a petition filed within the deadline specified in an initial notice of deficiency is timely under the last sentence of I. R. C. § 6213(a), despite a subsequent corrected notice specifying an earlier deadline?

### **Rule(s) of Law**

The last sentence of I. R. C. § 6213(a) states: "Any petition filed with the Tax Court on or before the last date specified for filing such petition by the Secretary in the notice of deficiency shall be treated as timely filed." Additionally, I. R. C. § 6212(d)

allows the Secretary, with taxpayer consent, to rescind a notice of deficiency, but without such consent, the original notice remains valid for purposes of § 6213(a).

## **Holding**

The Tax Court held that the Dodsons timely filed their petition pursuant to the last sentence of I. R. C. § 6213(a), and thus, the court had jurisdiction over the case. The petition was filed before the deadline specified in the first notice of deficiency, which was not rescinded and remained valid.

## **Reasoning**

The court reasoned that the first notice of deficiency was valid and not rescinded, as there was no evidence of mutual consent between the Dodsons and the Commissioner to rescind it. The last sentence of § 6213(a) was enacted to allow taxpayers to rely on the IRS's specified petition filing date, which in this case was December 5, 2022. The court rejected the Commissioner's arguments based on *Smith v. Commissioner* and *Rochelle v. Commissioner*, as those cases dealt with notices lacking specified petition filing dates, unlike the first notice in this case. The court emphasized that the statutory text of § 6213(a) was clear and did not require consideration of prejudice or representation by counsel. The court's interpretation aligned with the congressional intent to assist taxpayers in determining their filing deadlines and to allow reliance on the IRS's computation of those deadlines.

## **Disposition**

The Tax Court denied the Commissioner's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction, affirming that the Dodsons' petition was timely filed under the last sentence of I. R. C. § 6213(a).

## **Significance/Impact**

This decision reinforces the enforceability of the last sentence of I. R. C. § 6213(a), providing clarity and security for taxpayers in deficiency proceedings. It underscores that taxpayers can rely on the IRS's specified petition filing date in a notice of deficiency, even if the IRS later attempts to correct that date. The ruling may impact how the IRS handles notices of deficiency and corrections thereof, ensuring that taxpayers are not disadvantaged by subsequent changes to filing deadlines. It also highlights the importance of clear statutory language in protecting taxpayer rights and maintaining the integrity of Tax Court jurisdiction.