Ben Grote v. Commissioner, 41 B.T.A. 247 (1940)

Losses from transactions in commodity futures contracts are considered capital losses unless they constitute a true hedge against business risks, in which case they may be treated as ordinary business expenses.

Summary

Ben Grote, a suit manufacturer, sought to deduct a partnership loss from futures contracts in wool tops as an ordinary business expense carry-over. The partnership purchased these contracts after the outbreak of WWII, anticipating wool supply issues, but later sold them at a loss. The Board of Tax Appeals determined that these futures contracts were capital assets and the transactions were not true hedges. Therefore, the loss was classified as a short-term capital loss, which, due to lack of capital gains, could not generate a net operating loss carry-over for the partners' individual income tax in 1941. The Board emphasized that hedging must be directly linked to protecting against price fluctuations in actual business operations, not speculative or isolated transactions.

Facts

1. Petitioner Ben Grote was a partner in a business manufacturing men's suits from purchased piece goods.
2. The partnership sold finished suits to retailers through salesmen.
3. In September 1939, after the outbreak of World War II, the partnership purchased 100 wool top futures contracts.
4. This purchase was made due to concerns about future wool supply, not as a hedge against existing sales contracts.
5. In February 1940, the partnership sold these futures contracts at a loss of $95,750.
6. The partnership treated this loss as a cost of hedging to protect wool purchases and charged it to "Woolens Purchases" on their books.
7. The partnership did not take delivery of the wool tops and did not include the futures contracts in inventory.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the loss from the futures contracts was a short-term capital loss and disallowed the partnership's attempt to carry it over as a net operating loss. The petitioners appealed to the Board of Tax Appeals.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the loss of $95,750 from the sale of wool top futures contracts was a short-term capital loss as defined in Code Section 117.
2. Alternatively, whether the loss was deductible as an ordinary and necessary

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

business expense under Code Section 23(a) because it arose from hedging operations.

Holding

1. No, the loss was a short-term capital loss because the futures contracts were capital assets as defined in Code Section 117 and did not fall under any exceptions.
2. No, the loss was not an ordinary and necessary business expense because the transactions were not true hedging operations in the context of the partnership's business.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned as follows:
– Futures contracts are generally considered capital assets unless they fall under specific exceptions in Code Section 117, such as inventory, stock in trade, or property held primarily for sale to customers.
– The partnership's futures contracts were not inventory because futures contracts are not included in inventory according to Treasury Regulations and prior rulings (Regs. 103, Sec. 19.22(c)-1; A.R.R. 100; A.R.M. 135; *Commissioner v. Covington*; *Tennessee Egg Co.*).
– The contracts were not stock in trade or property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business (*Commissioner v. Covington*).
– The contracts were not subject to depreciation.
– Since the contracts were held for less than 18 months, any loss would be a short-term capital loss unless it resulted from a true hedge.
– True hedging transactions are treated as a form of business insurance, resulting in ordinary business expense deductions (G.C.M. 17322; *Ben Grote*; *Commissioner v. Farmers & Ginners Cotton Oil Co.*; *Kenneth S. Battelle*).
– A hedge is meant to reduce risk from price changes in commodities related to the business's operations, maintaining a balanced market position (*Commissioner v. Farmers & Ginners Cotton Oil Co.*).
– The partnership's futures contracts were not a hedge because they were not connected to present sales of clothing or a method of insuring against price changes in their ordinary course of business. Instead, it was an "isolated transaction" based on a "panicky condition" after the war outbreak, making it speculative, not a hedge.
– The court distinguished this case from *Kenneth S. Battelle*, where hedging was found to be present. Even in *Commissioner v. Farmers & Ginners Cotton Oil Co.*, where the taxpayer's transactions more closely resembled a hedge, the court still ruled against the taxpayer.
– The court quoted *Anna M. Harkness*, stating, "It seems to us to be fundamentally unsound to determine income tax liability by what might have taken place rather than by what actually occurred."

Practical Implications

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

– This case clarifies the distinction between capital asset transactions and ordinary business hedging in the context of commodity futures.
– It emphasizes that for futures transactions to be considered hedges and generate ordinary business losses, they must be integral to the taxpayer's business operations and serve as a direct form of price insurance against risks inherent in the business.
– Isolated or speculative purchases of futures contracts, even if related to business inputs, are unlikely to qualify as hedges, especially if not linked to existing business commitments or sales.
– Taxpayers must demonstrate a clear and direct relationship between their futures trading and the reduction of risks in their core business activities to claim ordinary loss treatment. Bookkeeping treatment alone (like charging to "Woolens Purchases") is not determinative.
– This case reinforces the principle that tax liability is based on what actually occurred (futures contract trading) rather than what might have occurred (taking delivery of wool tops).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.