Ring Construction Corporation v. Secretary of War, 8 T.C. 1070 (1947)

The retroactive application of the Renegotiation Act of 1942 to contracts entered into before its enactment is constitutional under the war powers of Congress, even if it impairs contractual obligations.

Summary

Ring Construction Corporation challenged the constitutionality of the Renegotiation Act of 1942 as applied to contracts it had entered into with the government before the Act's passage. The Tax Court upheld the Act's constitutionality, finding that Congress's war powers allowed it to retroactively regulate war profiteering, even if it meant impairing existing contracts. The court determined that Ring Construction's profits were excessive and subject to renegotiation under the Act. The court considered factors such as efficiency, reasonableness of costs and profits, and risk assumed, ultimately concluding that the company's profits exceeded reasonable levels, and some expenses were improperly classified as costs.

Facts

Ring Construction Corporation entered into two contracts with the U.S. government to construct barracks. Contract No. 1542 was executed after the passage of the Renegotiation Act, while the other was executed prior. Ring bid a total of $6,728,580 on the two contracts and received $6,918,988.51 for performance. Actual allowable job costs, exclusive of certain disputed elements, were $4,936,172.52. The company's president expected to reduce costs by shopping around for subcontractors.

Procedural History

The Secretary of War determined that Ring Construction Corporation had made excessive profits under the contracts and sought to renegotiate them under the Renegotiation Act. Ring Construction challenged this determination in the Tax Court, arguing that the Act was unconstitutional as applied retroactively and that its profits were not excessive. The Tax Court reviewed the case de novo.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the retroactive application of the Renegotiation Act to contracts entered into before its enactment is unconstitutional, violating the Fifth Amendment's due process clause.

2. Whether the Tax Court's exclusive jurisdiction to determine excessive profits, without review, violates due process.

3. Whether Ring Construction Corporation's profits were excessive under the Renegotiation Act, and if so, to what extent.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the war powers of Congress permit constitutional impairment of contracts between the government and a citizen during wartime.

2. No, this issue was decided against the petitioner in Stein Brothers Manufacturing Co., 7 T.C. 863 (1946).

3. Yes, to the extent of $1,249,929.94, because the company's profits exceeded what was reasonable considering the risks assumed and other relevant factors.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that Congress's war powers are broad enough to regulate war profiteering, even retroactively, and that the Fifth Amendment's due process clause does not prevent Congress from impairing contracts between the government and citizens when exercising its war powers. The court relied on cases like *United States v. Bethlehem Steel Corp.*, 315 U.S. 289 (1942), and *Hamilton v. Kentucky Distilleries Co.*, 251 U.S. 146 (1920), to support the constitutionality of retroactive legislation under the war powers. The court emphasized the necessity of preventing war profiteering to maintain soldier morale and strengthen the nation's war effort. Regarding the excessive profits, the court considered factors outlined in the Renegotiation Act, including efficiency, reasonableness of costs and profits, and risk assumed. It determined that Ring Construction's profits were excessive, even considering the risks involved, and disallowed certain expenses as costs. The court explicitly stated, "*contracts must be understood as made in reference to possible exercise of rightful authority of government, and no obligation of a contract can extend to the defeat of legitimate government authority.*"

Practical Implications

This case confirms the broad scope of Congress's war powers, allowing for retroactive economic regulation, including the renegotiation of contracts. It illustrates that the government can impair contractual obligations to address war profiteering. The case clarifies that while risk is a relevant factor in determining reasonable profits, it is not the sole determinant, and actual costs, rather than estimated costs, should be the primary basis for calculating profits. Later cases may cite this decision to support government actions that affect existing contracts during times of national emergency. It informs legal practice by emphasizing the importance of carefully documenting and justifying all costs and expenses when contracting with the government, particularly in sectors susceptible to renegotiation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.