

## **11 T.C. 952 (1948)**

Income is accrued when a fixed, unconditional right to receive it exists, and expenses are accrued when the liability is fixed and determinable, which often depends on the specific facts of the transaction and any contingencies.

### **Summary**

Federal Machine and Welder Co. disputed deficiencies assessed by the Commissioner regarding the accrual of income from a machinery sale and the deductibility of compensation and bonuses. The Tax Court held that income from the sale of machinery to Amtorg Trading Corporation did not accrue in 1940, when the work was substantially completed, but in 1941, when the sale to a different buyer was consummated. The court also found that compensation paid to the company president was reasonable, and that bonuses authorized and paid in 1941 for 1940 performance were accruable in 1941, not 1942.

### **Facts**

Federal Machine and Welder Co. manufactured welding equipment, including specialized machinery for Amtorg Trading Corporation (the Russian government's purchasing agency). In 1940, Amtorg placed an order for \$400,000 worth of equipment. After initial experiments and a purchase order, issues arose with steel specifications, delaying final inspection. The U.S. State Department then intervened, requesting a delay due to concerns the equipment's ultimate destination was not Russia. Although an invoice was sent to Amtorg in September 1940, the equipment was ultimately sold to the British Purchasing Commission in 1941 after the export license to Russia was cancelled.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Federal Machine and Welder Co.'s income tax, declared value excess profits tax, and excess profits tax for the taxable year ended September 30, 1941. The company petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of these deficiencies. The Tax Court reviewed the issues, including the timing of income accrual, the reasonableness of compensation, and the deductibility of bonus payments.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether the income from the sale of equipment to Amtorg accrued in the taxable year ended September 30, 1940, or in 1941 when it was sold to the British Purchasing Commission.
2. Whether the compensation paid to the petitioner's president in 1941 was excessive.

3. Whether bonuses authorized and paid in 1941 and 1942, based on 1940 and 1941 profits respectively, are accruable in the years they were authorized and paid, or in the years the profits were earned.

### **Holding**

1. No, because the sale to Amtorg was not consummated in 1940 due to unresolved issues with specifications, lack of final inspection, and U.S. government intervention which created uncertainty of delivery.

2. No, because the total compensation paid to the president was reasonable considering his experience, contributions to the company, and the company's increased profitability under his leadership.

3. The bonuses authorized and paid in 1941 for 1940 were accruable in 1941. The 1941 bonuses were accruable in 1942, because the liability to pay the bonuses became fixed and definite only when the board of directors approved the bonus amounts and recipients after the close of each fiscal year.

### **Court's Reasoning**

The court reasoned that income accrues when there is a fixed, unconditional right to receive it. Quoting from *Commissioner v. Glenshaw Glass*, the court noted, "There are no hard and fast rules of thumb that can be used in determining, for taxation purposes, when a sale was consummated, and no single factor is controlling; the transaction must be viewed as a whole and in the light of realism and practicality." Here, the court found that the sale to Amtorg was not complete in 1940 because of unresolved issues, lack of final inspection and concerns about government intervention, which created a contingency. Regarding compensation, the court emphasized the president's contributions and the absence of self-dealing. As for the bonuses, the court determined that liability became fixed only when the board approved the amounts and recipients, thus dictating the accrual year.

### **Practical Implications**

This case illustrates the importance of assessing all factors to determine the proper year for income and expense accrual. The case shows that sending an invoice does not automatically trigger income recognition. The determination of when "all events have occurred" which fix the right to receive income or the obligation to pay expenses is highly fact-dependent. Further, it provides insight into how the Tax Court assesses the reasonableness of executive compensation, examining the individual's qualifications, responsibilities, and the company's performance. Compensation arrangements determined at arms-length are persuasive evidence of reasonableness. Finally, it highlights that bonus accrual is contingent upon the existence of a fixed liability, often determined by the terms of the bonus plan and the actions of the board of directors. Later cases would cite this case to illustrate

accrual concepts.