Penalties Above 20%: What Are They, When Are They Applied, and How Do You Defend?

CAROLINE D. CIRAOLO KOSTELANETZ & FINK LLP WASHINGTON, D.C.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SCHOOL OF LAW 65TH ANNUAL TAXATION CONFERENCE

AUSTIN, TEXAS DECEMBER 13, 2017

The Growth of Penalties

Purpose of penalties

- "Penalties exist to encourage voluntary compliance by supporting the standards of behavior required by the [Code]."
 - Internal Revenue Manual ("I.R.M.") 20.1.1.2 (Feb. 22, 2008)
- Not intended as a revenue raiser

More than 150 civil penalties authorized

 \bullet More than 10-fold increase from the 13 penalties in 1954 Code

Statistics (FY 2016)

- IRS assessed 29.3 million civil penalties totaling \$27.3 billion
 - Approximately \$12.1 billion assessed against individuals, estates, trusts
- IRS abated 5.2 million civil penalties totaling \$8.9 billion

2

Developments in the Burden of Production

Burden of Production Updates

I.R.C. § 6751(b)(1)

- "No penalty under this title shall be assessed unless the <u>initial</u> determination of such assessment is personally approved (in writing) by the immediate supervisor of the individual making such determination or such higher level official as the Secretary may designate."
- Not applicable to:
 - · Additions to tax under I.R.C. §§ 6651, 6654, or 6655; and
 - Other penalties automatically calculated via electronic means
- TIGTA 2013 Report Re: Preparer Penalties
 - $^{\circ}$ 8% noncompliance rate in preparer context
 - Prevalence in deficiency cases?

2

Burden of Production Updates

- Deficiency cases:
 - Chai v. Commissioner, 851 F.3d 190 (2d Cir. 2017)
 - "[W]e hold that § 6751(b)(1) requires written approval of the initial penalty determination
 no later than the date the IRS issues the notice of deficiency (or files an answer or amended
 answer) asserting such penalty."
 - "[W]e further hold that compliance with § 6751(b) is part of the Commissioner's burden of
 production and proof in a deficiency case in which a penalty is asserted."
 - "Read in conjunction with § 7491(c), the written approval requirement of § 6751(b)(1) is
 appropriately viewed as an element of a penalty claim, and therefore part of the IRS's prima
 facie penalty case."
 - But see Graev v. Commissioner, 147 T.C. No 16 (2016)
 - "Because respondent has not yet assessed the section 6662 penalties at issue in this [deficiency] case, it is premature to consider whether respondent has satisfied section 6751(b)"
- CDP cases:
 - Graev v. Commissioner, 147 T.C. No. 16 (2016)
 - "We do not foreclose the possibility that a taxpayer who believes that a penalty has been
 assessed in violation of 6751(b)(1) might raise this issue in a postassessment collection due
 process (CDP) proceeding."

FOLIA and Discovery—Related Reguests

To gray of Name:
Tax Fore:
T

3





Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the <u>UT Law CLE eLibrary (utcle.org/elibrary)</u>

Title search: Penalties Above 20%: What Are They, When Are They Applied, and How Do You Defend?

Also available as part of the eCourse 2017 Taxation eConference

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the 65th Annual Taxation Conference session "Penalties Above 20%: What Are They, When Are They Applied, and How Do You Defend?"