27 T.C. 270 (1956)

A joint tax return can be binding even if one spouse did not sign it, if that spouse tacitly consented to its filing by accepting its benefits, such as a refund.

Summary

In *Heim v. Commissioner*, the U.S. Tax Court addressed whether a wife was bound by a joint tax return signed only by her husband and prepared by an accountant, even though she did not sign it herself. The court held that because the wife provided the necessary tax information, knew a return was filed on her behalf, and accepted a refund check resulting from the filing, she had given tacit consent to the joint return. The court determined the wife was therefore jointly and severally liable for the tax deficiency and, because the IRS failed to prove fraud, reversed the fraud penalty. The dissenting judges argued that the wife did not authorize the signing or filing of a joint return, and she should not be held liable.

Facts

Muriel Heim, the petitioner, was married to Russell Heim. Russell requested that the accountant, R.O. Salisbury, prepare a joint tax return for 1951. Muriel gave Salisbury her W-2 form, but gave no specific instructions as to the type of return. Salisbury signed Muriel's name to a joint return, which included both her and Russell's income. A refund check was issued to both Muriel and Russell, which they both endorsed and cashed. Muriel filed separate tax returns for the years immediately preceding and following 1951, but did not file one separately for 1951. She was informed by the IRS that she had filed a joint return. The Commissioner assessed a deficiency and an addition to the tax for fraud.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in income tax and an addition to the tax for fraud. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination, specifically addressing whether the wife tacitly consented to the filing of a joint return. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner, ruling that the joint return was valid based on the wife's actions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioner elected to file, and in fact filed, a joint income tax return for 1951.

2. If a joint return was filed, whether the petitioner is liable for the deficiency and addition to the tax under section 293(b) for fraud.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the petitioner acquiesced in and gave her tacit consent to the filing of the joint return by accepting the benefits of the return.

2. No, because the Commissioner did not sustain the burden of proving fraud by clear and convincing evidence.

Court’s Reasoning

The court referenced prior case law, establishing that a joint return can be binding even without one spouse’s signature. The court reasoned that Muriel knew a return was filed in her name, provided the necessary tax information, and accepted the refund benefits of the joint return. These actions demonstrated tacit consent to filing a joint return, thus binding her to it. The court noted that while Muriel testified she did not know a joint return was filed until later, the refund check should have made her aware of the joint filing. The court determined, however, that the Commissioner failed to prove fraud, as the evidence regarding Russell Heim’s fraud was insufficient to meet the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.