Camp Wolters Land Co. v. Commissioner, 160 F.2d 84 (5th Cir. 1947)

A corporation's existence as a taxable entity begins when its charter is filed and approved by the state, not necessarily when its organization is fully completed or when it states its incorporation date on tax returns.

Summary

Camp Wolters Land Company disputed the Commissioner's determination of its excess profits tax liability for 1941. The core issue revolved around when the company officially came into existence as a taxable entity: March 16, 1941 (as the company claimed), April 25, 1941 (when its charter was filed), or May 8, 1941 (when the company completed its organization). The Fifth Circuit affirmed the Tax Court's ruling, holding that the company's taxable existence began on April 25, 1941, the date its charter was filed and approved, based on Texas law and the need for consistent tax administration. This determination impacted the calculation of the company's excess profits tax and other deductions.

Facts

Several key facts influenced the court's decision:

- The company's articles of incorporation were executed on March 16, 1941.
- Substantial capital stock was paid in before February 15, 1941.
- The company borrowed money and began operating its business around March 16, 1941.
- The company's charter was filed and approved by the Texas Secretary of State on April 25, 1941.
- The company stated in its 1941 and 1942 tax returns that its incorporation date was May 8, 1941.
- A lease agreement between the company and the city was executed on May 8, 1941.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the company's excess profits tax for 1941. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination that the company's existence as a taxable entity began on April 25, 1941, not March 16 or May 8. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reviewed the Tax Court's decision.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court erred in determining that Camp Wolters Land Company came into existence as a separate taxable entity on April 25, 1941, rather than on March 16, 1941, or May 8, 1941.

2. Whether lease rentals for the period March 1 to April 25, 1941, are properly

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

includible in petitioner's income for 1941.

3. Whether petitioner is entitled to deduct from its gross income for 1941 any amount as a result of the transaction by which the promoters purchased in March 1941 the improvements on the Deakins, Maddux, and Sullivan tracts, which improvements were sold and removed in April 1941.

4. Whether and in what amounts petitioner is entitled to an allowance for depreciation in 1941 and 1942 on the buildings and improvements on the following tracts: Windham, Lamkin, Johnson and Watson, and Brock.

5. Whether petitioner is entitled to a deduction under section 23 (f) of the code claimed by it in its return for 1942 for a loss allegedly resulting from the destruction by fire of "2 Story Ranch House, Garage, Barns, Corrals" on the Windham tract

Holding

1. No, because under Texas law, a corporation's existence begins when its charter is filed with the Secretary of State, and there was no compelling legal reason to deviate from this rule.

2. Yes, because this issue was not raised by the pleadings.

3. No, because the company failed to establish that it acquired, sold, and removed the improvements after it came into existence.

4. No, because such an allowance cannot be permitted in the absence of proof of the cost of these improvements on the date of their acquisition by petitioner.

5. No, because there was no proof of the value of the improvements destroyed by the fire.

Court's Reasoning

The court primarily relied on Texas state law, which dictates that a corporation's existence begins upon the filing of its charter with the Secretary of State. The court cited Article 1313, Vernon's Annotated Texas Statutes, stating, "The existence of the corporation shall date from the filing of the charter in the office of the Secretary of State." The court rejected the argument that the company's earlier activities or its later completion of organizational details should determine its tax status. The court distinguished *Florida Grocery Co., 1 B. T. A. 412*, noting that in this case, unlike Florida Grocery, the company was engaged in business and had income from April 25th. The court emphasized the importance of consistent application of tax laws, particularly concerning the annualization of excess profits net income. The court highlighted the practical benefits of adhering to the charter filing date for administrating the excess profits tax under Section 711(a)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Practical Implications

This case provides a clear rule for determining when a corporation becomes a taxable entity for federal income tax purposes, primarily hinging on state law regarding corporate formation. It emphasizes the importance of the official charter filing date over other factors like preliminary activities or internal organizational milestones. The ruling affects how short-year tax returns are calculated and how deductions and income are allocated during the initial period of corporate existence. Later cases and IRS guidance often cite *Camp Wolters Land Co.* as a key authority on this issue, ensuring consistent treatment for newly formed corporations. This case informs legal practice by underscoring the necessity of carefully documenting the charter filing date and aligning tax reporting with the corporation’s legal inception date.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.