10 T.C. 90 (1948)

A loss sustained on the sale of rejected goods is not considered an abnormal deduction if the taxpayer regularly experiences similar types of losses, even if smaller in amount.

Summary

Tovrea Land and Cattle Company sought an adjustment to its excess profits net income for 1938, arguing that a loss from rejected beef sold in Manila constituted an abnormal deduction. The meat, purchased for a government contract, was rejected and sold at a loss. The Tax Court held that the loss was not abnormal in class because Tovrea regularly experienced losses from rejected or spoiled goods, even if the Manila loss was significantly larger. The court also upheld the Commissioner's partial disallowance of a repair expense deduction.

Facts

Tovrea Land and Cattle Co., an Arizona corporation, processed and sold meat products. In 1938, Tovrea contracted with the U.S. Government to deliver beef in Manila. To fulfill this contract, Tovrea purchased beef from Cudahy Packing Co., which warranted the meat met government specifications. The government rejected the entire shipment upon arrival in Manila. Cudahy refused to accept the returned meat or refund the purchase price. Tovrea sold the rejected beef in Manila at a loss. Tovrea also claimed a deduction for building repairs.

Procedural History

Tovrea sought to adjust its 1938 excess profits net income due to the loss from the rejected beef. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the adjustment. Tovrea also claimed a deduction for repairs which was partially disallowed. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the loss sustained in 1938 from the sale of rejected beef in Manila constitutes an abnormal deduction under Section 711(b)(1)(J)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code for excess profits tax purposes.
2. Whether the Commissioner erred in disallowing a portion of the deduction claimed for building repairs in the taxable year.

Holding

1. No, because the loss was not abnormal in class to the petitioner, as it regularly experienced losses due to rejected or spoiled goods, even if the Manila loss was larger.
2. No, because the petitioner failed to establish that it was entitled to a repair

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

expense deduction exceeding the amount allowed by the Commissioner.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that to qualify as an abnormal deduction, the deduction must be abnormal in class. Referencing *Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Electric Co.* and *Oaklawn Jockey Club*, the court emphasized that deductions of the same class are not considered abnormal simply because they are for different purposes. Even though Tovrea had not previously experienced a total rejection of a shipment, it routinely made price adjustments for damaged or spoiled products. The court found “no logical difference in character between such minor losses normally experienced by petitioner and the loss sustained because an entire shipment of meat was rejected…They have common characteristics and differ only in degree.” The court also noted that Tovrea’s bookkeeping treated the loss similarly to other sales adjustments. The court also found that Tovrea did not adequately show the repair expenses were, in fact, only repairs and not improvements to the building. The court stated, “Until a transaction is closed and completed, the loss is not sustained.”

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the “abnormal deduction” standard for excess profits tax, emphasizing that a deduction’s class is determined by its nature, not its size or specific cause. Taxpayers must demonstrate that a deduction is truly different in kind from their typical business expenses to qualify for an adjustment. The court’s reliance on consistent bookkeeping practices also highlights the importance of accurate financial records in tax disputes. This case informs how businesses should analyze potential abnormal deductions, focusing on the overall class of expense rather than isolated incidents. It stands for the proposition that a large instance of a normal business risk will not be considered an abnormal deduction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.