7 T.C. 648 (1946)

Treasury Regulations cannot override the plain language and intent of the Internal Revenue Code, particularly when the regulation restricts deductions in a way not supported by the statute.

Summary

Mackin Corporation, an installment basis taxpayer, elected under Section 736(a) of the Internal Revenue Code to compute its income for excess profits tax purposes on the accrual basis. The company then took bad debt deductions for installment accounts receivable arising from pre-1940 sales. The Commissioner disallowed these deductions, citing a regulation prohibiting such deductions. The Tax Court held that the Commissioner's regulation was invalid because it conflicted with the intent of Section 736(a) to provide relief to installment basis taxpayers and because the regulation effectively amended the law by disallowing deductions where the statute did not. The court emphasized that the regulation was an unwarranted extension of the statute.

Facts

Mackin Corporation, a retail seller of clothing and jewelry, had consistently reported its income on the installment method. After 1942, the company qualified and elected to compute its income for excess profits tax purposes on the accrual basis under Section 736(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. In its amended excess profits tax returns for 1940 and 1941, Mackin claimed bad debt deductions for installment accounts receivable stemming from sales made before January 1, 1940. The Commissioner disallowed these deductions based on Treasury Regulations.

Procedural History

Mackin Corporation filed amended excess profits tax returns for 1940 and 1941, claiming deductions that the Commissioner disallowed. Mackin then petitioned the Tax Court for review of the Commissioner's determination. The Tax Court consolidated the proceedings and addressed the validity of the Treasury Regulation in question.

Issue(s)

Whether the Commissioner's regulation, which prohibited the inclusion of deductions for bad debts on account of installment sales made in taxable years beginning before January 1, 1940, in the computation of excess profits net income, is a valid interpretation of Section 736(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the Commissioner's regulation is an unwarranted extension of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

statute and effectively amends the law by disallowing deductions where the statute does not provide for such disallowance.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 736(a) was enacted as a relief provision to address the hardship faced by installment basis taxpayers during the war years. The court stated, "Recognizing the hardship which thus befell installment basis taxpayers as compared with other taxpayers, Congress gave relief in section 736 (a) by providing that those installment basis taxpayers who could meet certain qualifications might elect to report their income, for excess profits tax purposes, on the accrual basis in lieu of the installment basis." The court emphasized that neither Section 736(a) nor its legislative history indicated any intention to alter the statutory provisions concerning deductions. Furthermore, the court found that the regulation's attempt to equalize treatment between installment and accrual taxpayers was flawed, as accrual taxpayers were already allowed deductions for expenses related to pre-1940 sales. The court noted that the regulation effectively disallowed deductions for the unrecovered cost of goods sold, which was inconsistent with established principles of tax law. The Court stated, "We think it an unwarranted extension of the term 'included' in section 736 (a) to read into it, as the Commissioner has done in his regulation, any provision with respect to deductions. The Commissioner is without authority thus to amend the law."

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the limits of Treasury Regulations and emphasizes that such regulations must be consistent with the intent and language of the Internal Revenue Code. The decision reinforces the principle that tax regulations cannot arbitrarily disallow deductions without explicit statutory authority. It serves as a reminder that courts will scrutinize regulations that appear to expand or contract the scope of tax laws beyond what Congress intended. The case has implications for interpreting other tax statutes and regulations, particularly in situations where the regulations appear to contradict the underlying legislative intent or create inequities not contemplated by the statute. This case dictates that taxpayers can challenge regulations that overstep statutory boundaries.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.