Grob Brothers, 9 T.C. 495 (1947)

The Renegotiation Act applies to subcontractors even if individual subcontracts are for less than $100,000, as long as the aggregate of amounts received under subcontracts during the fiscal year exceeds $500,000.

Summary

Grob Brothers, a subcontractor, challenged the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board's determination that it realized excessive profits subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act. Grob argued that the Act did not apply because none of its individual contracts exceeded $100,000. The Tax Court rejected this argument, holding that the Act applied because the aggregate of Grob's subcontract amounts received during the fiscal year exceeded $500,000, regardless of individual contract size. The court found that Grob failed to prove the Board's determination of excessive profits was incorrect and upheld the Board's assessment.

Facts

Grob Brothers was a subcontractor engaged in war production during 1943. The aggregate of the amounts Grob received or accrued under its various subcontracts during the fiscal year exceeded $1,692,243.98. The War Contracts Price Adjustment Board determined that Grob's profits were excessive to the extent of $60,000. Grob argued that it was not subject to renegotiation because it did not have any individual contracts exceeding $100,000. The Commissioner argued the excessive profits were at least $75,000.

Procedural History

The War Contracts Price Adjustment Board determined that Grob Brothers had excessive profits of $60,000. Grob Brothers petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the excessive profits. The Commissioner requested the Tax Court to determine the excessive profits were at least $75,000.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Renegotiation Act applies to a subcontractor when no individual subcontract exceeds $100,000, but the aggregate of amounts received or accrued under subcontracts in a fiscal year exceeds $500,000.
2. Whether the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board's determination of excessive profits was arbitrary, unreasonable, and capricious.

Holding

1. Yes, because the statutory definition of "subcontract" is broad, and the intent of Congress was to limit profits derived from war production by both contractors and subcontractors regardless of individual contract size, provided the aggregate

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

exceeds the statutory threshold.
2. No, because the evidence showed that the various statutory factors were taken into consideration in determining that petitioner's profits were excessive, and the remaining net profits allowed the petitioner a reasonable margin.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 403(b) of the Renegotiation Act, requiring renegotiation provisions in subcontracts exceeding $100,000, does not limit the Board's power to renegotiate under Section 403(c). Subsection (c) grants the Board the power to renegotiate when amounts received under subcontracts may reflect excessive profits, applying to all contracts and subcontracts to the extent of amounts received or accrued in any fiscal year exceeding $500,000. The court stated, "the statutory definition of a subcontract is extremely broad, and the obvious intent of Congress was to limit profits derived from war production by both contractors and subcontractors." The court also emphasized that the administrative interpretation adopted early by renegotiating authorities supported this view. Regarding the excessive profits determination, the court found no evidence that the Board acted arbitrarily, noting that the statutory factors were considered, and Grob's remaining profits allowed a reasonable margin. The court noted, "We think it quite clear that the provisions of section 403 (b) are not a limitation on tbe definition of subcontract in section 403 (a) (5) (A)."

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies the scope of the Renegotiation Act, establishing that subcontractors cannot avoid renegotiation simply by structuring their war-related business into numerous smaller contracts. It reinforces the broad authority granted to the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board (and subsequent similar agencies) to review and adjust profits deemed excessive in the context of government contracts. This case serves as a reminder that substance prevails over form; the aggregate value of subcontracts, not the individual contract amounts, determines applicability. Subsequent cases have cited Grob Brothers for the proposition that the Renegotiation Act is to be broadly construed to prevent excessive war profits.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.