



TaxNewsFlash

United States



No. 2023-275
August 8, 2023

D.C. Circuit: Exaction related to employer mandate under Affordable Care Act is a tax for jurisdictional purposes

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit today affirmed a decision of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia holding that an exaction under section 4980H—part of the “employer mandate” enacted as part of the “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act” (Pub. L. No. 111-148, March 2010) (the “Affordable Care Act” or ACA)—is a “tax” for purposes of the Anti-Injunction Act, which strips courts of jurisdiction over suits having the “purpose of restraining the assessment or collection of any tax” under section 7421(a). Accordingly, the D.C. Circuit affirmed the district court’s dismissal of the appellant’s suit for lack of jurisdiction.

The case is: *Optimal Wireless LLC v. IRS*, No. 22-5121 (D.C. Cir. August 8, 2023). Read the D.C. Circuit’s [decision](#) [PDF 185 KB]

Summary

The ACA obligates large employers to provide their full-time employees with health insurance coverage meeting certain requirements. If an employer fails to provide coverage or provides noncomplying coverage, it is liable for an exaction under section 4980H.

In 2019, the IRS sent two letters proposing exactions under section 4980H to the appellant, a wireless communications company. The appellant then filed an action against the IRS and the Department of Health and Human Services, claiming that the agencies had failed to satisfy certain procedural requirements before imposing the proposed exactions. After the district court dismissed the appellant’s suit for lack of jurisdiction, the appellant appealed to the D.C. Circuit.

Today, the D.C. Circuit affirmed the district court’s dismissal of the appellant’s suit on the grounds that a section 4980H extraction is a “tax” for purposes of the Anti-Injunction Act’s jurisdictional bar.

The court noted that the Supreme Court upheld the individual mandate under the ACA in *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012) (NFIB), as a constitutional exercise of Congress’s power to tax. However, the Supreme Court also held in NFIB that the exaction for noncompliance with the individual mandate was not a “tax” for purposes of the Anti-Injunction Act because Congress repeatedly described that exaction as a “penalty” rather than a “tax.”

In contrast, Congress described the section 4980H exaction for noncompliance with the employer mandate as a “tax” four different times. Although Congress also labeled the same exaction an “assessable payment” or a “penalty,” that did not dissuade the court from concluding that its repeated references to the exaction as a “tax” require treating it as one for purposes of the Anti-Injunction Act.

The court specifically rejected the appellant’s argument that section 4980H must contain a clear statement that its exactions constitute a “tax” because the statute subject to that “high bar” is the jurisdictional bar under the Anti-Injunction Act, not section 4980H. The court stated that the question of whether another statute is best read to implicate the Anti-Injunction Act’s jurisdictional bar—which in this case turns on whether section 4980H imposes a “tax”—is governed by ordinary principles of statutory interpretation, not by any clear-statement rule.

The court also noted that other circuits have disagreed on whether a section 4980H exaction is a “tax” for purposes of the Act’s jurisdictional bar (compare *Hotze v. Burwell*, 784 F.3d 984 (5th Cir. 2015) (section 4980H exaction is a tax) with *Liberty University, Inc. v. Lew*, 733 F.3d 72 (4th Cir. 2013) (section 4980H exaction is not a tax); see also *Korte v. Sebelius*, 735 F.3d 654 (7th Cir. 2013) (indicating that section 4980H exaction would not constitute a tax).

kpmg.com/socialmedia



The information contained in TaxNewsFlash is not intended to be “written advice concerning one or more Federal tax matters” subject to the requirements of section 1037(a)(2) of Treasury Department Circular 230, as the content of this document is issued for general informational purposes only, is intended to enhance the reader’s knowledge on the matters addressed therein, and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organization.

KPMG International Limited is a private English company limited by guarantee and does not provide services to clients. No member firm has any authority to obligate or bind KPMG International or any other member firm vis-à-vis third parties, nor does KPMG International have any such authority to obligate or bind any member firm.

Direct comments, including requests for subscriptions, to [Washington National Tax](https://www.washingtonnationaltax.com). For more information, contact KPMG’s Federal Tax Legislative and Regulatory Services Group at + 1 202.533.3712, 1801 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20006-1301.

To unsubscribe from TaxNewsFlash-United States, reply to [Washington National Tax](https://www.washingtonnationaltax.com).

[Privacy](#) | [Legal](#)