

Hello. It looks like you're using an ad blocker that may prevent our website from working properly. To receive the best experience possible, please make sure any blockers are switched off and refresh the page.

If you have any questions or need help you can email us

with that deadline, then the court will most likely dismiss the claim.

May. 23, 2017



Everyone is familiar with statutes of limitations under the law: simply, they provide a deadline by which a lawsuit must be commenced and if the plaintiff fails to comply with that deadline, then the court will most likely dismiss the claim. Barrels of ink have been spilled by courts writing about exceptions to the statutes, timing of when claims accrue, if the limitations period is tolled, and whether the statute even applies at all to the denominated claim. But without exception, a statute of limitations can be a very good friend to a business and, managed correctly, can even be a tool to affirmatively manage risk and exposure.

While statutes of limitation provide vital protection, six years is a long time.

Hello. It looks like you're using an ad blocker that may prevent our website from working properly. To receive the best experience possible, please make sure any blockers are switched off and refresh the page.

If you have any questions or need help you can email us

time frame of your exposure and mitigate those risks? The New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Department, recently permitted an accounting firm to do just that. In the case of *Aaron v. Deloitte Tax, LLP*, 2017 NY Slip Op 03051 (1st Dept. April 20, 2017), the Court dismissed claims against Deloitte and affirmed Deloitte's contractual statute of limitations of *one year* for claims brought against the accounting firm.

Deloitte was hired by William Davidson in 2008 to perform estate planning in connection with Mr. Davidson's \$3 billion estate. Deloitte, in its engagement letter, specified that "[n]o action, regardless of form, relating to this engagement, may be brought by either party more than one year after the cause of action has accrued ...". Deloitte allegedly created an estate plan under which the Estate would pay only an estimated \$158 million in estate taxes. Davidson executed that plan and made transfers of hundreds of millions of dollars to trusts for his chosen beneficiaries. In 2009, Deloitte cautioned Mr. Davidson that the IRS would likely challenge his estate plan. And, in fact, after Mr. Davidson died, the IRS did challenge the plan and served a notice of deficiency for \$2.7 billion against the Estate. This was eventually settled for \$457 million in 2015. Deloitte continued to provide advice and tax assistance through the IRS challenge period until the matter settled in 2015. The Estate, after settlement with the IRS, then brought claims against Deloitte for fraud, malpractice, negligent misrepresentation, and violation of section 349 of New York's General Obligations Law.

Deloitte moved to dismiss the complaint based on, among other things, that the claims brought against it were untimely due to the contractually shortened limitations period of one year in the 2008 engagement letter. The trial court agreed, finding that contractually shortened limitations periods are acceptable under New York law and that claims for malpractice for tax advice accrue on the date that the

advice is given (and not, therefore, on the date that the advice results in damage to

Hello. It looks like you're using an ad blocker that may prevent our website from working properly. To receive the best experience possible, please make sure any blockers are switched off and refresh the page.

If you have any questions or need help you can email us

available because the statute of limitations in question here – one year – was contractual and not statutory.

As a result, the complaint seeking \$500 million in damages from Deloitte was dismissed and the plaintiff, who may have had good claims for malpractice, went away with no recourse because those claims were barred due to the contract with the professional service provider.

If you have not had your engagement letters and your contracts with your clients looked at recently, it may be time for a check up.

Jeremy E. Deutsch is a shareholder in Anderson Kill's New York office and is Chair of the firm's Corporate and Securities group. Mr. Deutsch has over 20 years' experience in business law, including transactional and day to day legal counseling as well as complex corporate and commercial litigation.

CPA Practice Advisor is registered with the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy (NASBA) as a sponsor of continuing professional education on the National Registry of CPE Sponsors.

© 2024 Firmworks, LLC. All rights reserved