8 T.C. 928 (1947)

A taxpayer can obtain excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code if a change in the character of their business during the base period resulted in an inadequate standard of normal earnings.

Summary

Lamar Creamery Co. sought relief from excess profits tax for 1941 and 1942 under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, arguing its average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings. The company claimed a change in its business character due to the addition of ice cream mix production warranted a constructive average base period net income. The Tax Court agreed in part, finding the introduction of ice cream mix significantly changed the business but adjusted the company's proposed constructive income, ultimately granting a partial relief from the excess profits tax.

Facts

Lamar Creamery Co. manufactured dairy products and bottled milk in Paris, Texas. The company began producing ice cream mix in 1938, establishing a separate department for it in 1939. Prior to 1938, ice cream mix sales were minimal and only as accommodations to existing clients. Before 1938, the company primarily focused on pasteurized milk and condensed milk. In 1935, Carnation Company opened a plant nearby, leading to increased milk prices and competition. The company filed applications for relief under Section 722, claiming its base period net income was not representative of its normal earnings because of losses from a Greenville plant and increased milk costs due to Carnation's presence, as well as the new ice cream mix business.

Procedural History

Lamar Creamery paid excess profits tax for 1941 and 1942 and subsequently filed applications for relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, which the Commissioner disallowed. The company then petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination of its excess profits tax liability. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's disallowance.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Lamar Creamery's average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to temporary economic circumstances, specifically competition from Carnation, under Section 722(b)(2)?
2. Whether Lamar Creamery's average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings because the company changed its business character by adding ice cream mix production under Section 722(b)(4)?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the competition faced by Lamar Creamery was not a temporary economic circumstance unusual to the taxpayer.
2. Yes, because the addition of ice cream mix production changed the character of the business, and the average base period net income did not reflect the normal operation for the entire base period.

Court's Reasoning

Regarding Section 722(b)(2), the court reasoned that competition, even if it increased costs, is a normal aspect of business and not a "temporary economic circumstance unusual in the case of the taxpayer." The court noted that Carnation's plant was a permanent fixture, making it a long-term competitor, therefore, no relief was granted on this ground.

Regarding Section 722(b)(4), the court found the introduction of ice cream mix production to be a significant change in the character of Lamar Creamery's business, constituting a "difference in the products…furnished." The court deemed that the company's average base period net income did not accurately reflect the business's normal operation across the entire base period. The Court determined that the ice cream mix business had not yet reached its full earning potential by the end of the base period. The court reconstructed the company's income to reflect what it would have earned had the change occurred two years earlier, but adjusted the company's estimate to 2,000,000 pounds, calculating the constructive average base period net income to be $15,975.53.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on what constitutes a "change in the character of the business" for purposes of Section 722(b)(4) excess profits tax relief. The decision highlights that merely adding a new product line can qualify as a change in business character if it's substantial and represents a difference in the products furnished. Furthermore, it clarifies that a taxpayer must demonstrate the change had a tangible impact on their earning potential during the base period. Subsequent cases and rulings have cited *Lamar Creamery* for its analysis of Section 722(b)(4) and its emphasis on reconstructing income to reflect a normal earning level had the business change occurred earlier in the base period. This case is particularly relevant for tax practitioners advising businesses that underwent significant operational or product-related changes during the World War II excess profits tax era.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.