8 T.C. 52 (1947)

A taxpayer can establish entitlement to excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code if it demonstrates that its average base period net income is an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to commencing business during the base period and changing the character of its business.

Summary

7-Up Fort Worth Company sought relief from excess profits tax for 1942 and 1943, arguing that its average base period net income was not representative of its normal earnings due to starting business mid-base period and changes in its operations. The Tax Court held that the company demonstrated that its initial base period income was an inadequate standard due to mismanagement, necessitating a constructive average base period net income calculation. The court determined a fair and just amount representing normal earnings to be used as a constructive average base period net income.

Facts

In 1937, Clarence Kloppe purchased the Fort Worth and Dallas 7-Up franchises, establishing the 7-Up Fort Worth Company. J.R. Payne was appointed president and placed in charge of operations for both plants. The initial management led to high sales volume but significant debt. Kloppe discovered financial discrepancies and after investigation, Payne resigned in July 1938. J.M. George became plant manager in August 1938. The company underwent a reorganization to reduce expenses. In December 1939, the company acquired the right to bottle and sell Nesbitt orange beverage, beginning sales in early 1940.

Procedural History

7-Up Fort Worth Company applied for excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the application. The company petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination, arguing its average base period net income didn’t reflect normal earnings due to changes in business character and commencement during the base period.

Issue(s)

Whether the Tax Court erred in determining that the petitioner was not entitled to excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the Tax Court correctly determined that the petitioner’s average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to the commencement of business and changes in its character, entitling it to relief under

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 722(b)(4), but the constructive average base period net income claimed by the taxpayer was too high.

Court’s Reasoning

The court focused on Section 722(b)(4), which addresses situations where a taxpayer commenced business or changed its character during the base period, leading to an unrepresentative average base period net income. The court found that the initial mismanagement by Payne constituted a significant change in operations when Kloppe took over and implemented cost-cutting measures. The court considered whether the acquisition of the Nesbitt franchise constituted a significant change in the products furnished. While the court acknowledged the introduction of Nesbitt orange drink as a factor, it also emphasized the company’s failure to demonstrate a reliable basis for the sales volume it projected for this new product. The court found the company’s proposed reconstructed average base period net income of $36,300.35 to be too high and determined a constructive average base period net income of $12,153.91 based on a volume of 127,756 cases of 7-Up and 20,730 cases of Nesbitt orange drink.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on how businesses can demonstrate entitlement to excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(4) by showing that their base period income was not representative of normal earnings. It highlights the importance of providing concrete evidence to support claims for reconstructed sales volumes, and that unsupported opinions are insufficient. It demonstrates that courts may consider post-base period data only to the extent necessary to establish the normal earnings to be used as the constructive average base period net income. Later cases have cited this ruling as an example of how to establish a constructive average base period net income when a business has undergone significant changes during the base period.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.