

## Supreme Court overruling of *Chevron v. NRDC* expected to strengthen challenges to tax regulations

July 15, 2024 | Client Update | 8-minute read

In *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, the Supreme Court overruled *Chevron v. NRDC*, holding that *Chevron* deference to an agency's permissible interpretation of an ambiguous or silent statute conflicted with the longstanding proposition that courts decide legal questions. The effect will reach all areas of federal agency action – including those of Treasury – although the full effect of the decision remains to be seen.

If you have any questions regarding the matters covered in this publication, please reach out to any of the lawyers listed below or your usual Davis Polk contact.

**Mario J. Verdolini**

+1 212 450 4969  
mario.verdolini@davispolk.com

**Christopher A. Baratta**

+1 212 450 3115  
christopher.baratta@davispolk.com

**William A. Curran**

+1 212 450 3020  
william.curran@davispolk.com

**Margaret E. Tahyar**

+1 212 450 4379  
margaret.tahyar@davispolk.com

*This communication, which we believe may be of interest to our clients and friends of the firm, is for general information only. It is not a full analysis of the matters presented and should not be relied upon as legal advice. This may be considered attorney advertising in some jurisdictions. Please refer to the firm's privacy notice for further details.*

<sup>1</sup> *Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Def. Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 843 (1984).

<sup>2</sup> *Smiley v. Citibank (South Dakota) N.A.*, 517 U.S. 735, 740-41 (1996).

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>3</sup> 603 U.S. \_\_\_ (2024) (No. 22-451), together with *Relentless, Inc. v. Dep't of Commerce*, No. 22-1219).

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, slip op. at 7-8.

## **Tax takeaways**

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>5</sup> *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch 137 (1803).

## **Tax takeaways**

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating**

## regulations

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>6</sup> *Loper Bright*, slip op. at 9 (quoting *Decatur v. Paulding*, 14 Pet. 497, 515 (1840)).

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>8</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 706.

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>9</sup> *Loper Bright*, slip op. at 14.

## **Tax takeaways**

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 16.

## **Tax takeaways**

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating**

## regulations

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>11</sup> *Loper Bright* (Thomas, J., concurring), slip op. at 1-4.

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>12</sup> *Loper Bright* (Gorsuch, J., concurring), slip op. at 1-34.

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>13</sup> *Loper Bright* (Kagan, J., dissenting), slip op. at 1-33.

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>14</sup> *Mayo Foundation for Medical Educ. & Research v. United States*, 562 U.S. 44, 55 (2011).

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., *United States v. Home Concrete Supply, LLC et al.*, 566 US 478 (2012); *Hewitt v. Comm'r*, 21 F.4th 1336 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2021); *Good Fortune Shipping SA v. Comm'r*, 897 F.3d 256 (D.C. Cir. 2018); *Green Valley Investors LLC v. Comm'r*, 159 T.C. 80 (2022).

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

### **3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury’s approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>16</sup> Order dated July 1, 2024, *FedEx Corporation v. United States*, No. 2:20-cv-02794-SHM-tmp, ECF No. 63 (W.D. Tenn).

## **Tax takeaways**

### **1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

### **2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

### **3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury’s approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., *Loper Bright*, slip op. at 17; see also *Loper Bright* (Gorsuch, J., concurring), slip op. at 17.

## **Tax takeaways**

### **1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

### **2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

### **3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury’s approach to promulgating regulations**

[17] *Id.* at 17.

[22] *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>18</sup> *Skidmore v. Swift & Co.*, 323 U.S. 134, 140 (1944).

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

<sup>[17]</sup> *Id.* at 17.

<sup>[22]</sup> *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

**3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations**

<sup>[17]</sup> *Id.* at 17.

<sup>[22]</sup> *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

<sup>20</sup> *Loper Bright*, slip op. at 35.

## Tax takeaways

**1. Challengers to Treasury regulations likely to be emboldened**

**2. But Treasury regulations will continue to be given respect and possibly even controlling discretion depending on the particular statutory delegation**

### 3. No immediate change in administrative appeals and some potential change in Treasury's approach to promulgating regulations

[\[17\]](#) *Id.* at 17.

[\[22\]](#) *Id.* at 18 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 750 (2015)).

[21](#) *Id.* at 17.