Legislative Recommendation #45

Promote Consistency With the Supreme Court’s Boechler Decision by Making the Time Limits for Bringing All Tax Litigation Subject to Equitable Judicial Doctrines

SUMMARY

- **Problem:** The U.S. Supreme Court has held that the Tax Court may toll the 30-day deadline for filing a petition in a Collection Due Process (CDP) case when it is equitable to do so (e.g., if a taxpayer misses a filing deadline because he has had a heart attack and is temporarily incapacitated). Other provisions of the IRC also contain filing deadlines, but it is not clear whether courts have the authority to toll those deadlines on equitable grounds.

- **Solution:** Clarify that federal courts may toll filing deadlines in tax cases when it is equitable to do so.

PRESENT LAW

Various provisions of the IRC authorize proceedings or suits against the government, provided such actions are brought timely. If a time limit for bringing suit is deemed a jurisdictional requirement, it cannot be waived or forfeited. IRC § 7442, which relates to the jurisdiction of the Tax Court, does not specify that prescribed periods for petitioning the Tax Court are jurisdictional. IRC § 7451(b) provides a statutory tolling rule for the filing of petitions in any case in which a filing location is inaccessible or otherwise unavailable to the general public on the date a petition is due, but it does not address whether the period for filing a petition is subject to equitable tolling.

Equitable doctrines that, if available, might excuse an untimely filing include (1) equitable tolling (applicable when it is unfair to hold a plaintiff/petitioner to a statutory deadline because of facts and circumstances that unduly impeded the plaintiff/petitioner’s compliance); (2) forfeiture (applicable when the parties have acted as if the case need not operate under the statutory deadlines); and (3) waiver (applicable when the parties have agreed explicitly that a case need not operate under legal deadlines).

The Supreme Court held in the Boechler case that the 30-day time limit in IRC § 6330(d)(1) to file a petition with the Tax Court for review of a CDP determination is not a jurisdictional requirement. The Court noted that time limits that are not jurisdictional are presumptively subject to equitable tolling and explained that “we treat a procedural requirement as jurisdictional only if Congress ‘clearly states’ that it is.” After parsing the language of IRC § 6330(d)(1), the Court found no such clear statement. The Court further held that the 30-day period in IRC § 6330(d)(1) is subject to equitable tolling.

Taxpayers generally bring their actions in the U.S. Tax Court, a U.S. district court, or the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.  

---

1 IRC § 7442 provides in its entirety:
   The Tax Court and its divisions shall have such jurisdiction as is conferred on them by this title, by chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, by title II and title III of the Revenue Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 10-87), or by laws enacted subsequent to February 26, 1926.

2 Boechler, P.C. v. Comm’r, 596 U.S. 199 (2022), rev’g and remanding 967 F.3d 760 (8th Cir. 2020).

3 Id. at 203.

4 Id. at 208-211.

5 Some tax claims may also be heard by U.S. bankruptcy courts. The Supreme Court has held that the three-year lookback period that may qualify a tax liability for discharge in bankruptcy is subject to equitable tolling. Young v. United States, 535 U.S. 43, 47 (2002).
U.S. Tax Court

CDP cases like the one in the Boechler case are not the only type of controversy in which taxpayers, by filing a petition in the Tax Court within a specified period, may litigate their tax liabilities without first paying the tax. Other examples include deficiency proceedings and “standalone” innocent spouse cases (i.e., where a taxpayer seeks innocent spouse relief in situations other than in response to a notice of deficiency or as part of a CDP proceeding).

IRC § 6213(a) provides that “[w]ithin 90 days ... the taxpayer may file a petition with the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.” The Supreme Court in Boechler acknowledged that lower courts have interpreted the IRC § 6213(a) deadline as jurisdictional and therefore not subject to equitable tolling but noted that “almost all [such lower court cases] predate this Court’s effort to ‘bring some discipline’ to the use of the term ‘jurisdictional.’” After the Supreme Court issued its decision in the Boechler case, the Tax Court held that equitable tolling does not apply to deficiency cases. In a separate case, however, the Third Circuit disagreed and held that the IRC § 6213(a) deadline is not jurisdictional and is subject to equitable tolling.

As for IRC provisions imposing time limits for petitioning the Tax Court to determine the appropriate innocent spouse relief in stand-alone cases, the Supreme Court in Boechler noted that IRC § 6015(e)(1)(A) “much more clearly link[s] [its] jurisdictional grant[s] to a filing deadline,” but the Court did not decide whether the time limit is jurisdictional. Prior to Boechler, three appellate courts agreed with the Tax Court and held that the time limit for requesting stand-alone innocent spouse relief is jurisdictional.

Other Federal Courts

Taxpayers seeking refunds may obtain judicial review in federal courts other than the Tax Court if they sue within a specified period. A refund suit can generally be brought in a U.S. district court or in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims within two years from the date the IRS denies a claim. There is a split among the circuits regarding whether the statutory period for bringing a suit for refund is subject to equitable doctrines.

Similarly, parties, other than the taxpayers, with an interest in or lien on levied property may sue in a U.S. district court to enjoin enforcement of a wrongful levy or sale or to recover property (or proceeds from the sale of property) if they do so within a specified period (generally, within two years of levy). Several federal
courts have held that the period is not subject to equitable tolling, but other appellate courts have held that it is. Taxpayers may also bring suit, if they do so within the specified periods, to seek civil damages in a U.S. district court or bankruptcy court regarding unauthorized actions by the IRS. Courts have differed on whether equitable doctrines can toll the period for bringing suit.

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

The *Boechler* decision clarified that the filing deadline in CDP cases is not jurisdictional and that the deadline is subject to equitable tolling, but it did not address whether filing deadlines in other tax cases are jurisdictional or subject to equitable tolling. There is inconsistency in lower courts’ interpretations of the various statutes that contain filing deadlines in tax cases.

The consequence for failing to commence suit in the Tax Court or another federal court within the time limits prescribed by the IRC is severe – taxpayers lose their day in Tax Court, which may be the only prepayment forum, or other federal courts with jurisdiction to hear their claims.

Treating the IRC time limits for bringing suit as jurisdictional – which means that taxpayers who file suit even seconds late are barred from court regardless of the cause – can lead to harsh and unfair results. For example, the IRS itself occasionally provides inaccurate information to taxpayers regarding the filing deadline, and even in that circumstance, the court has declined to hear the taxpayer’s case. Other extenuating circumstances may include a medical emergency (e.g., a heart attack or other medical condition that requires a taxpayer to be hospitalized). Moreover, most U.S. Tax Court petitioners do not have representation, and unrepresented taxpayers are less likely to recognize the severe consequences of filing a late petition.

The *right to a fair and just tax system* requires that equitable doctrines be available to excuse a late filing in extenuating circumstances. Taxpayers would still be required to demonstrate that an equitable doctrine applies, and courts could apply the doctrines narrowly. However, the National Taxpayer Advocate believes courts should have the flexibility to make those determinations.

---

14 *See Becton Dickinson and Co. v. Wolckenhauer*, 215 F.3d 340, 351-354 (3d Cir. 2000), and cases cited therein from four other circuits (holding that the IRC § 6532(c) period is jurisdictional and not subject to equitable tolling).

15 *See, e.g., Volpicelli v. United States*, 777 F.3d 1042, 1047 (9th Cir. 2015) (holding that the IRC § 6532(c) period is subject to equitable tolling); *Supermail Cargo, Inc. v. United States*, 68 F.3d 1204 (9th Cir. 1995) (same).

16 IRC §§ 7431(d), 7432(d)(3), 7433(d)(3).

17 *Compare Aloe Vera of America, Inc. v. United States*, 580 F.3d 867, 871-872 (9th Cir. 2009) (holding that the time for bringing suit under IRC § 7431 is not subject to equitable tolling) and *Hynard v. IRS*, 233 F. Supp. 2d 502, 509 (S.D. N.Y. 2002) (holding that the time for bringing suit under IRC § 7433 is not subject to equitable tolling), *with Ramos v. United States*, 90 A.F.T.R.2d (RIA) 7176 (N.D. Cal. 2002) (denying motion to dismiss because doctrine of equitable tolling might apply to an IRC § 7433 action), and *Bennett v. United States*, 366 F. Supp. 2d 877, 879 (D. Neb. 2005) (holding that the application of equitable tolling to IRC §§ 7432 and 7433 actions has not been definitively determined, but it is an extraordinary remedy and did not apply in this case).

18 *See, e.g., Nauflett*, 892 F.3d at 652-54 (doctrine of equitable tolling did not apply to innocent spouse case despite reliance on alleged erroneous IRS advice regarding the filing deadline); *see also Rubel v. Comm’r*, 856 F.3d 301, 306 (3d Cir. 2017).

19 Eighty percent of taxpayers were unrepresented before the Tax Court in fiscal year 2022. United States Tax Court, *Congressional Budget Justification, Fiscal Year 2024* at 23 (Feb. 1, 2023), [https://ustaxcourt.gov/resources/budget_justification/FY_2024_Congressional_Budget_Justification.pdf](https://ustaxcourt.gov/resources/budget_justification/FY_2024_Congressional_Budget_Justification.pdf).

20 *See IRC § 7803(a)(3)(J); IRS, Taxpayer Bill of Rights*, [https://www.irs.gov/taxpayer-bill-of-rights](https://www.irs.gov/taxpayer-bill-of-rights) (last visited Nov. 16, 2023) (identifying the “right to a fair and just tax system” as a taxpayer right). The Taxpayer Bill of Rights (TBOR) lists rights that already existed in the tax code, putting them in simple language and grouping them into ten fundamental rights. Employees are responsible for being familiar with and acting in accord with TBOR, including the “right to a fair and just tax system.”
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Enact a new section of the IRC to clarify that the periods in the IRC within which taxpayers may petition the Tax Court or file suit in other federal courts are not jurisdictional and are subject to equitable judicial doctrines.\(^{21}\)
- Specify that equitable tolling periods are included in timeliness determinations for purposes of enjoining any actions or proceedings or ordering any refunds or relief.\(^{22}\)

---

21 If this change to the IRC is enacted, a late-filed petition in the Tax Court would no longer be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction if the taxpayer is able to establish that equitable tolling should apply. That would mean that a dismissal of a petition from a notice of deficiency by the Tax Court due to untimeliness would be treated as a decision on the merits under IRC § 7459(d), and the doctrine of res judicata would prevent the taxpayer from pursuing a refund suit. We therefore recommend that IRC § 7459(d) be correspondingly amended to make clear that a dismissal based on untimeliness is not a decision on the merits.

22 For example, the last two sentences of IRC § 6213(a) provide that:

The Tax Court shall have no jurisdiction to enjoin any action or proceeding or order any refund under this subsection unless a timely petition for a redetermination of the deficiency has been filed and then only in respect of the deficiency that is the subject of such petition. 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.