7 T.C. 1350 (1946)

For excess profits tax purposes, abnormal income, such as dividends from a foreign subsidiary, is attributed to the years in which the earnings and profits were accumulated, considering the events that led to the income and the reasonableness of the attribution.

Summary

Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Electric Co. sought a determination from the Tax Court regarding deficiencies in income and excess profits taxes. The core dispute centered on the proper allocation of a dividend received from its Canadian subsidiary for excess profits tax purposes, along with the deductibility of certain taxes and expenses. The court addressed whether the dividend should be attributed to the year it was received or to prior years when the profits were earned, the deductibility of Chapter 1 tax, and the treatment of specific tax and expense deductions as normal or abnormal. The Tax Court held that the majority of the dividend was attributable to prior years, that the Chapter 1 tax was fully deductible, and ruled on the abnormality of certain deductions, impacting the company's excess profits tax liability.

Facts

Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Electric Co. received a dividend from its Canadian subsidiary. This dividend was the first it had ever received from the subsidiary. Canadian wartime controls required permission from the Foreign Exchange Control Board to transfer funds out of Canada. The dividend was paid out of accumulated earnings, but the Commissioner sought to attribute the dividend to the current tax year. The company also took deductions for property taxes, salaries paid in excess of the employment period (representing pensions, sickness pay, etc.), and interest payments. The Commissioner challenged these deductions.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Electric Company's income and excess profits taxes for 1940 and 1941. The company petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination, alleging overpayment of excess profits tax. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determinations and the company's claims regarding the allocation of dividend income and the deductibility of various expenses.

Issue(s)

1. Whether any portion of a dividend from a foreign subsidiary, constituting net abnormal income, should be allocated to the taxable year 1940 for excess profits tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether the portion of Chapter 1 tax attributable to abnormal income from prior years is deductible in computing excess profits net income for 1940.

3. Whether a special school tax assessment is abnormal.

4. Whether income for base period years should be adjusted for property taxes paid.

5. Whether income for the base period year 1937 should be adjusted for amounts paid as pensions, sickness pay, severance allowance, and payments to widows.

6. Whether income for base period years should be adjusted for interest paid on a note issued July 1, 1937.

Holding

1. No, because only the amount of the dividend equal to the earnings and profits of the Canadian subsidiary during the period from January 1 to March 15, 1940, should be attributed to the taxable year 1940.

2. Yes, because the amount of Chapter 1 tax is deductible without reduction.

3. No, because the special assessment is not of a class abnormal for the petitioner.

4. Yes, in part, because a portion of the property taxes was abnormal in amount and should be disallowed.

5. Yes, because the payments were abnormal in amount and should be disallowed.

6. Yes, because the interest deductions were abnormal in amount and should be disallowed.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that, under Section 721 and related regulations, abnormal income should be attributed to the years in which it originated, considering the specific events and the reasonableness of the attribution. The court emphasized that “Items of net abnormal income are to be attributed to other years in the light of the events in which such items had their origin, and only in such amounts as are reasonable in the light of such events.” Regarding the dividend, the court found that the majority of the earnings were accumulated in prior years and should be attributed to those years. The court rejected the Commissioner’s argument that the entire dividend should be attributed to 1940 based on a strict interpretation of Section 115, stating that such an interpretation would conflict with the intent of Section 721. The court also ruled that the full amount of Chapter 1 tax was deductible because the statute makes no provision for reducing the deduction based on the exclusion of abnormal income. Finally, the court determined that the special school tax was not abnormal as to class, but that certain deductions (property taxes,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

salaries paid in excess of employment period, and interest) were abnormal in amount and should be disallowed to the extent they exceeded 125% of the average for the four previous years and were not a consequence of an increase in gross income or a change in the business.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies how abnormal income, particularly dividends from foreign subsidiaries, should be allocated for excess profits tax purposes. It emphasizes the importance of considering the origin of the income and the reasonableness of attributing it to specific years. Attorneys and tax professionals should analyze the source and circumstances surrounding abnormal income to ensure proper allocation and minimize tax liabilities. This case also illustrates the limited scope of the Commissioner's authority to create regulations that contradict the intent of the statute. It highlights the necessity of carefully documenting the nature and purpose of deductions to support their classification as normal or abnormal.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.