Kronish v. Commissioner, 90 T. C. 684 (1988)

A taxpayer's signature on a consent form to extend the period of limitations on tax assessments constitutes assent to the form's terms, and the doctrine of equitable estoppel does not apply without proof of false representation or misleading silence.

Summary

Peggy Kronish signed a Form 872 to extend the statute of limitations for her 1978 tax assessment, believing it conformed to her attorney's instructions. The form, however, was broader than intended. When the IRS sought another extension, Kronish's attorney signed it despite objections. The Tax Court held that Kronish's signature on the first form constituted assent, and the IRS was not estopped from relying on it due to lack of evidence of false representation or misleading silence. This case underscores the importance of carefully reviewing consent forms and the high threshold for invoking equitable estoppel against the government.

Facts

Peggy Kronish, advised by her attorney Barry Feldman, received a Form 872 from the IRS in February 1982 to extend the period of limitations on assessment for her 1978 tax year. Feldman was on vacation and instructed Kronish to ensure the form was restricted to adjustments from Churchill Research. Kronish signed the form, believing it met these criteria, but it was broader. In January 1983, the IRS requested another extension, which Feldman signed despite his objections. The IRS issued a deficiency notice in June 1984, before the second extension expired.

Procedural History

Kronish filed a petition in the United States Tax Court challenging the validity of the consent forms. The court considered whether the first consent form was valid and whether the IRS was equitably estopped from relying on it. The Tax Court ultimately ruled in favor of the Commissioner, finding the first consent form valid and that equitable estoppel did not apply.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Kronish's signature on the first consent form constituted mutual assent to its terms, despite her belief that it was restricted to Churchill flowthrough items.
2. Whether the IRS should be equitably estopped from relying on the first consent form due to alleged misrepresentations or misleading silence.

Holding

1. Yes, because Kronish's overt act of signing the form established her assent to its terms, regardless of her subjective understanding.
2. No, because Kronish failed to prove any false representation or misleading silence

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

by the IRS.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that mutual assent to a consent form is determined by objective manifestations, not subjective intent. Kronish’s signature on the first consent form was an overt act demonstrating her assent. The court cited contract law principles, emphasizing that her signature bound her to the form’s terms, even if she misunderstood its scope. Regarding equitable estoppel, the court noted the high burden of proof required to apply the doctrine against the government. Kronish failed to provide admissible evidence of any false representation or misleading silence by the IRS. The court also rejected Kronish’s argument that the IRS’s letters accompanying the consent forms constituted misrepresentations, as they did not explicitly describe the scope of the forms.

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the importance of carefully reviewing and understanding consent forms before signing them, particularly in tax matters. Taxpayers and their representatives must ensure that any limitations or restrictions are clearly stated in the document itself, not just in accompanying correspondence. The high threshold for invoking equitable estoppel against the government means that taxpayers cannot rely on oral assurances or misunderstandings to challenge the validity of signed forms. This case may influence how tax practitioners advise clients on extensions of the statute of limitations and the need for clear, written agreements. Subsequent cases have cited Kronish for its holdings on mutual assent and the application of equitable estoppel in tax disputes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.