RM

	UNITED STATES TAX Washington, DC 2		COP	
la nri)))		
	Petitioner,	Dock	tet No.	L
v.))		
Commissioner of Internal Ro	evenue,)		
	Respondent.	j.		
ORDER O	F DISMISSAL FOR LAC	CK OF JURIS	DICTION	
On 2008, rest the ground that no notice of confer jurisdiction on this C 2002. On 2008, supplemented his objection stated that he did not receiv his last known address on for taxable year 2002.	spondent also filed a Motion determination under I.R.C. court was issued to petitione detitioner filed an Objection 2008. In the the notices of intent to level, 2006, for taxa	n To Dismiss for 6320 or 6330 er with respect in to the motion e objection, as say that respondable year 2001,	or Lack of Jursidic or other notice suf to taxable years 20 to dismiss; petitio supplemented, peti ent alleged were n and on	etion on efficient to 001 and oner itioner mailed to 2006,
By Order dated motion to dismiss and attact for taxable years 2001 and respondent's contention that address on 200 a Supplement to the motion to establish that notices of if for the taxable years in issue on petitioner's Social Security.	2002, as well as documental to notices of intent to levy well as documental, 2006, and to dismiss in which responsitent to levy were properly e was not available. According	ces of intent to ation or facts surere mailed to p 6. On andent conceded mailed to petit rdingly, respondent	levy mailed to pet officient to support petitioner's last known 2008, respond that verfication su- tioner's last known	titioner titioner two two dent filed ufficient n address
the levy against petitioner's occurred prior to the Social Respondent attached a For	Security Administration m	is been released taking any payn elease of Prope	I and that the releament to respondent erty from Levy, to	ise t. the status

Mootness, and moves the Court to deny the motion to dismiss on lack of jurisdiction, as supplemented. However, because no notice of determination or other notice sufficient to confer jurisdiction on this Court was issued by respondent, this Court lacks jurisdiction. Accordingly, respondent motion to dismiss on ground of mootness is not appropriate and will be denied.

Upon due consideration and for cause, it is

ORDERED that petitioner's Motion To Restrain Assessment or Collection is denied as moot. It is further

ORDERED that respondent's Motion To Dismiss on Ground of Mootness is denied. It is further

ORDERED that respondent's Motion To Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction, as supplemented, is granted in that this case is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction on the ground that no valid notice of intent to levy was issued to petitioner.

