

## **Alert** | Tax Controversy and Litigation



May 2023

### **Supreme Court Affirms IRS Power to Summons Bank Information Without Notice to Delinquent Taxpayer**

Resolving a decades-old circuit court split on Internal Revenue Service (IRS) summons authority, on May 18, 2023, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a unanimous decision in *Polselli v. Internal Revenue Service* granting the IRS broad power to summons third parties to aid in the collection of a tax debt without giving notice to the account holders.

The Court was tasked with determining whether the IRS, pursuant to powers granted in Internal Revenue Code (IRC) section 7609(c)(2)(D)(i), is entitled to issue third-party summonses, without notice, for bank account records in which the taxpayer targeted by the summons does not have a legal interest. The circuits have been split in determining when the no-notice limitation under IRC Section 7609(c)(2)(D)(i) applies. The Sixth Circuit historically allowed the IRS to issue a summons for an account holder's records without notice, even to collect on someone else's tax liabilities. However, the Ninth Circuit held that the notice exception could only apply if the delinquent taxpayer had a legal interest in the targeted account. The Court ultimately sided with the Sixth Circuit's interpretation, finding that the language in IRC section 7609(c)(2)(D)(i) did not require such legal interest.

The IRS has the authority to issue summonses to seek information from taxpayers during an examination and to pursue payment of taxes. In an effort to limit this broad power, IRC section 7609 generally requires the IRS to provide notice of any summons issued to a third party, to the target identified in the summons. The notice requirement is important because it allows the target of the summons to bring a motion to quash the summons. IRC § 7609(b). However, section 7609(c)(2)(D)(i) provides an exception to the

notice requirement when the IRS issues a third-party summons “in aid of the collection of an assessment made or judgment rendered against the person with respect to whose liability the summons is issued.” Notably, under the Anti-Injunction Act, these no-notice summonses do not allow for parties to bring motions to quash the summons, which can limit a taxpayer’s ability to stop the IRS from obtaining the third-party’s summonsed records.

In *Polselli*, the IRS entered an official assessment against Remo Polselli for more than \$2 million in unpaid taxes and penalties that Polselli did not pay. The IRS then issued summonses on three banks, seeking financial records of several third parties including Polselli’s wife and two law firms that represented Polselli. These third parties were given notice by the banks who received the summonses, and one of the third parties moved to quash the summons. In the summons litigation that ensued, the third parties argued that the no-notice exception in section 7609(c)(2)(D)(i) only applied if the taxpayer had some legal interest in the accounts or the records sought by the summons.

The Supreme Court’s decision is based on its finding that section 7609(c)(2)(D)(i) sets forth only three specific conditions to exempt the IRS from providing notice. The Court found it notable that the statute does not mention a “legal interest” or require that a taxpayer maintain an interest in an account for the exception to apply.

While the Court unanimously found for the IRS, the decision expressed “apprehension about the scope of the IRS’s power to issue summonses.” The Court declined to determine what “in aid of the collection” of an assessment or judgment means, which, in other cases, could still limit the IRS’s ability to issue summonses without giving notice. The Court reasoned that the definition of the term “in aid of ... collection” was not raised in the lower court and therefore, defining this phrase was not appropriate for consideration in *Polselli*. Because the Court did not define “in aid of ... collection,” there may be further battles with the IRS to limit its ability to issue summonses without providing the required notice to impacted taxpayers.

## Authors

This GT Alert was prepared by the following members of **GT’s Tax Controversy and Litigation Group**:

- **G. Michelle Ferreira** | +1 415.655.1305 | [ferreiram@gtlaw.com](mailto:ferreiram@gtlaw.com)
- **Scott E. Fink** | +1 212.801.6955 | [finks@gtlaw.com](mailto:finks@gtlaw.com)
- **Barbara T. Kaplan** | +1 212.801.9250 | [kaplanb@gtlaw.com](mailto:kaplanb@gtlaw.com)
- **Jennifer A. Vincent** | +1 415.655.1249 | [vincentj@gtlaw.com](mailto:vincentj@gtlaw.com)

Additional Group Members:

- **Jared E. Dwyer** | +1 305.579.0564 | [dwyerje@gtlaw.com](mailto:dwyerje@gtlaw.com)
- **Courtney A. Hopley** | +1 415.655.1314 | [hopleyc@gtlaw.com](mailto:hopleyc@gtlaw.com)
- **Sharon Katz-Pearlman** | +1 212.801.9254 | [Sharon.KatzPearlman@gtlaw.com](mailto:Sharon.KatzPearlman@gtlaw.com)
- **Shira Peleg** | +1 212.801.6754 | [pelegs@gtlaw.com](mailto:pelegs@gtlaw.com)
- **James T. Smith** | +1 415.590.5104 | [James.Smith@gtlaw.com](mailto:James.Smith@gtlaw.com)

Albany. Amsterdam. Atlanta. Austin. Berlin. ~ Boston. Charlotte. Chicago. Dallas. Delaware. Denver. Fort Lauderdale. Houston. Las Vegas. London.\* Long Island. Los Angeles. Mexico City.+ Miami. Milan.» Minneapolis. New Jersey. New York. Northern Virginia. Orange County. Orlando. Philadelphia. Phoenix. Portland. Sacramento. Salt Lake City. San Diego. San Francisco. Seoul.∞ Shanghai. Silicon Valley. Tallahassee. Tampa. Tel Aviv.^ Tokyo.‡ Warsaw.~ Washington, D.C.. West Palm Beach. Westchester County.

*This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. ~Greenberg Traurig's Berlin office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. \*Operates as a separate UK registered legal entity. +Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. »Greenberg Traurig's Milan office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Santa Maria, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ∞Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. ^Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. ‡Greenberg Traurig's Tokyo Office is operated by GT Tokyo Horitsu Jimusho and Greenberg Traurig Gaikokuhojimbengoshi Jimusho, affiliates of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ~Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by GREENBERG TRAURIG Nowakowska-Zimoch Wysokiński sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in GREENBERG TRAURIG Nowakowska-Zimoch Wysokiński sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2023 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*