3 T.C. 922 (1944)

A taxpayer receiving reimbursement for processing taxes included in the price of purchased goods is subject to unjust enrichment tax if they shifted the tax burden to their customers, and an exemption for exported goods applies only to the consignor, shipper, or the person originally liable for the tax.

Summary

Insular Sugar Refining Corporation, a Philippine company, sought to avoid unjust enrichment tax on reimbursements received for cotton processing taxes included in the price of cotton bags it purchased in the U.S. and used to package sugar. The company argued that the tax burden wasn't shifted to customers and that an exemption applied because the bags were exported. The Tax Court ruled against Insular Sugar, holding that the company failed to prove it didn't shift the tax burden and that the export exemption only applied to the consignor, shipper, or original taxpayer, not the purchaser of the goods.

Facts

Insular Sugar Refining Corporation (Insular), a Philippine company, purchased cotton bags from Pacific Diamond H Bag Co. (Diamond) in the United States to package its sugar. Diamond included the cotton processing tax in the price of the bags. Insular exported approximately 90% of its sugar to the U.S. After the tax was deemed unconstitutional, Diamond received a refund from the government and reimbursed Insular for the tax burden included in the price of the bags. Insular did not file timely unjust enrichment tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies against Insular for unjust enrichment tax and a penalty for failing to file timely returns. Insular petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the tax liability and arguing for an exemption. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, finding Insular liable for the tax and penalty.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the reimbursements received by Insular are exempt from unjust enrichment tax because the cotton bags were exported.
2. Whether Insular shifted the burden of the cotton processing tax to its vendees, thereby being unjustly enriched by the reimbursements.
3. Whether Insular is liable for the penalty for failure to file timely tax returns.

Holding

1. No, because the exemption for exported goods applies only to the consignor,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

shipper, or the person originally liable for the tax, and Insular did not qualify under any of these categories.
2. Yes, because Insular failed to prove that it did not shift the tax burden to its customers.
3. Yes, because Insular provided no evidence to show that the failure to file timely returns was due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 501(b) of the Revenue Act of 1936 exempts reimbursements only if the vendee would have been entitled to a refund of the federal excise tax. Section 17(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act specifies that refunds are allowed to the consignor named in the bill of lading, the shipper if the consignor waives the claim, or the person liable for the tax if the consignor waives the claim. Insular was the consignee, not the consignor, and there was no evidence Diamond waived its claim. The court emphasized the precise statutory language: "The statute is unambiguous and, hence, there is no occasion to resort to legislative history as an aid to its construction… Since the persons to whom refunds are allowable are specified, it follows that refunds are not allowable to others."

Regarding the shifting of the tax burden, the court noted that Insular bore the burden of proving it did not shift the tax. While Insular argued it did not intend to shift the tax and did not bill it separately, the court stated that intent is not decisive. The critical question is whether the burden was in fact shifted. The court pointed to evidence that Insular increased its price by 10 cents per 100 pounds of sugar when the cotton processing tax went into effect, an amount greater than the tax itself. This price increase, coupled with a lack of evidence regarding profit margins, led the court to conclude that Insular failed to prove it absorbed the tax.

Regarding the penalty, the court stated that Section 291 of Title I prescribes a 25 percent penalty for failure to file a timely return unless due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect. The court stated, "No evidence was adduced to explain the delay in filing the instant returns. If there were mitigating circumstances for it, they were within petitioner's knowledge and it was incumbent upon it to present them for our consideration."

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of carefully examining statutory language when determining eligibility for tax exemptions or refunds. It demonstrates that a taxpayer's intent is not the sole factor in determining whether a tax burden has been shifted. Evidence of price increases coinciding with the imposition of a tax can be strong evidence of burden-shifting, even without direct evidence of intent. It also underscores the taxpayer's burden to provide evidence of reasonable cause when contesting failure-to-file penalties. The case also serves as a reminder that procedural compliance, such as timely filing returns, is critical in tax matters. This

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

case suggests that businesses should carefully document the rationale behind price adjustments during periods of changing tax policies.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.