6 T.C. 67 (1946)

The Tax Court's jurisdiction over excess profits tax issues under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code is limited to cases where the taxpayer has paid the tax, filed a refund claim, and received a notice of disallowance from the Commissioner.

Summary

American Coast Line sought to challenge the Commissioner's determination of its excess profits tax liability for 1940 and claim relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court addressed whether it had jurisdiction to consider the Section 722 claim, given that the taxpayer hadn't paid the tax, filed a refund claim, or received a disallowance notice. The court held it lacked jurisdiction because the statutory requirements for Tax Court review under Section 732 weren't met, and prior versions of Section 722(d) did not independently confer jurisdiction under the circumstances.

Facts

American Coast Line, initially inactive, was reactivated in 1939 to purchase and operate a steamship. The company operated the ship until June 7, 1940, when it was sold to the British Government for a significant profit. The company filed income tax returns for 1933-1935. The company requested permission to file tax returns on a fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, which the Commissioner granted effective June 30, 1940, contingent upon filing calendar year returns for 1937-1939 and a short-period return. The company filed calendar year returns for 1939 and 1940, but didn't pay the 1940 excess profits tax. It applied for Section 722 relief, which the Commissioner denied.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in American Coast Line's excess profits tax for 1940 and denied its claim for relief under Section 722. The company petitioned the Tax Court, challenging the deficiency determination and the denial of Section 722 relief. The Commissioner challenged the Tax Court's jurisdiction over the Section 722 issue.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Commissioner erred in determining the excess profits tax liability on a calendar year basis rather than on a fiscal year basis ended June 30, 1940.

2. Whether the Tax Court had jurisdiction to consider and decide whether the petitioner was entitled to relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, given that the petitioner had not paid the tax, filed a claim for refund, and received a notice of disallowance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioner kept its books and filed its returns on a calendar year basis and never received permission to file any tax return for a period beginning prior to December 31, 1939, and ending thereafter.

2. No, because the petitioner had not met the requirements under Section 732 for Tax Court review, and any jurisdiction previously conferred by Section 722(d) had been effectively repealed by amendment.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the excess profits tax applied to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1939. The petitioner was trying to show it had a fiscal year beginning before that date to avoid the tax. The Commissioner's grant of permission to use a fiscal year was conditional, and the petitioner didn't meet those conditions. The court emphasized that the petitioner filed its excess profits tax return for the calendar year 1940, aligning with its accounting practices.

Regarding jurisdiction over the Section 722 claim, the court analyzed the legislative history of Section 722 and Section 732. It noted that Section 732 expressly confers jurisdiction on the Tax Court in Section 722 cases when a refund claim has been disallowed. The court stated that the 1943 amendment to Section 722(d) eliminated references to the Board of Tax Appeals (now Tax Court) and that the current law requires taxpayers to pay the tax, file a refund claim, and receive a disallowance notice before seeking Tax Court review. Since the petitioner hadn't met these requirements, the court lacked jurisdiction. The court stated: "The benefits of this section shall not be allowed unless the taxpayer within the period of time prescribed by section 322 and subject to the limitation as to amount of credit or refund prescribed in such section makes application therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the jurisdictional requirements for bringing a Section 722 claim before the Tax Court. It underscores the necessity of first exhausting administrative remedies—paying the tax, filing a refund claim, and receiving a disallowance—before seeking judicial review. This decision impacts tax litigation strategy by requiring taxpayers to meticulously follow the prescribed procedures to ensure the Tax Court has the authority to hear their Section 722 claims. This case demonstrates the importance of adhering to statutory requirements for establishing jurisdiction in tax disputes, especially concerning claims for refunds or adjustments based on abnormalities affecting income or capital.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.