Sennett v. Commissioner, 69 T. C. 694, 1978 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 181 (1978)

Parties are bound by stipulations made in a test case, unless fraud on the court is proven in that case.

Summary

In Sennett v. Commissioner, the Tax Court upheld the binding nature of a stipulation made in a test case, Abraham v. Commissioner, despite allegations of fraud. The Sennetts, partners in a California partnership, sought summary judgment based on the favorable outcome in Abraham, which the IRS agreed would govern their case. The IRS claimed fraud in Abraham but had not moved to reopen it. The court granted summary judgment, ruling that the IRS must directly challenge the Abraham decision rather than collaterally attacking it in the Sennetts' case.

Facts

The Sennetts were partners in Professional Properties Partnership (PPP). The IRS disallowed certain deductions claimed by PPP, leading to deficiency determinations for the Sennetts. These issues were litigated in a test case, Abraham v. Commissioner, where the court ruled in favor of the taxpayer. Both parties had stipulated that the Abraham decision would govern the Sennetts' case. The IRS later alleged fraud in Abraham but had not moved to reopen that case.

Procedural History

The Sennetts filed motions for summary judgment in the Tax Court, arguing that the Abraham decision should apply to their case per the stipulation. The IRS opposed, claiming fraud in Abraham. The Tax Court granted the Sennetts' motions for summary judgment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the IRS is bound by its stipulation to apply the Abraham decision to the Sennetts' case, despite allegations of fraud in Abraham.

Holding

1. Yes, because the IRS must directly challenge the Abraham decision rather than collaterally attacking it in the Sennetts' case. The stipulation remains binding until Abraham is overturned.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Rule 121 of the Tax Court Rules of Practice and Procedure, which governs stipulations. The court reasoned that the IRS's allegations of fraud in Abraham did not relieve it of its stipulation in the Sennetts' case. The IRS had not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

moved to reopen Abraham despite having the opportunity to do so. The court cited Toscano v. Commissioner, which allows reopening a final Tax Court decision if fraud on the court is proven. However, the court emphasized that the IRS must directly challenge Abraham, not collaterally attack it in other cases. The court also noted that any fraud in Abraham would apply to the Sennetts' case due to shared counsel, but until Abraham is overturned, the stipulation stands.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the importance of stipulations in tax litigation, particularly in test cases. Practitioners should be aware that stipulations are binding unless directly challenged and overturned. The IRS cannot avoid a stipulation by alleging fraud in a related case without pursuing that claim directly. This ruling may encourage more use of test cases to resolve common issues efficiently among multiple taxpayers. It also highlights the need for careful consideration before entering into stipulations, as they may be difficult to escape even with allegations of fraud. Subsequent cases have followed this principle, upholding the binding nature of stipulations in tax litigation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.