Sherin Mfg. Co. v. Commissioner, 13 T.C. 446 (1949)

A corporation is not taxable on income derived from illegal activities of its officers when the corporation itself did not authorize, participate in, or directly benefit from those activities.

Summary

Sherin Mfg. Co. was assessed tax deficiencies and fraud penalties based on unreported income from side agreements made by its president, Berger. Berger, with the help of his assistant Biehl, collected over-ceiling payments from customers during wartime price controls and did not initially report the income. The Tax Court held the corporation was not liable for tax on these unreported amounts because it did not authorize or benefit from Berger's actions. However, Berger was found liable for fraud due to his initial failure to report the income on his personal return. The court also addressed depreciation rates, equity invested capital, and other expense deductions.

Facts

During World War II, Ernest Biehl, assistant to Berger, the president of Sherin Mfg. Co., arranged side deals with seven new customers. These agreements provided the new customers with preferential treatment in exchange for payments above the established OPA ceiling prices. Biehl kicked back 90% of these excess payments to Berger. The standard contract form was used, and the over-ceiling payments were not reflected on the corporation's books. Sherin, the other 50% owner of the company, was unaware of the arrangement and disavowed it upon discovery.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Sherin Mfg. Co.'s income tax and assessed fraud penalties. The Commissioner also determined a deficiency in Berger's personal income tax. Sherin Mfg. Co. and Berger petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination of these deficiencies.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the corporation is taxable on amounts exceeding OPA ceiling prices paid to its president by customers without the corporation's authorization or direct benefit.
2. Whether Berger's initial failure to report income from the side agreements constituted fraud, despite his later filing of an amended return.
3. Whether the Commissioner properly adjusted the depreciation rate on the corporation's machinery and equipment.
4. Whether the issuance of stock for unpaid salaries qualifies as equity invested capital.
5. Whether the Commissioner correctly determined the amount of interest paid

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

on borrowed capital.
6. Whether the Commissioner properly disallowed a portion of the corporation's traveling and entertainment expense deduction.
7. Whether the Commissioner properly disallowed a portion of a partnership's traveling and entertainment expense deduction, thereby increasing Berger's income.

Holding

1. No, because the corporation never authorized the illegal arrangements, nor did it receive, directly or indirectly, any benefit from the transactions.
2. Yes, because Berger's original return was false and fraudulent, and the subsequent filing of an amended return did not eliminate the fraud.
3. Yes, because the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the increased usage of machinery resulted in a shortening of its useful life.
4. Yes, because the stock was issued for unpaid salaries and accounted for as income by the recipients.
5. The court determined the specific amounts of interest paid on borrowed capital.
6. The court determined a reasonable amount for traveling and entertainment expenses.
7. No, the record did not justify disturbing the respondent's action.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the corporation was not liable because it never authorized the illegal side agreements and did not benefit from them. Although Berger was president and a 50% shareholder, his actions were deemed personal and not attributable to the corporation, especially since the other shareholder, Sherin, repudiated the agreements. The court stated, "Here the corporation never had command over the illegal commissions." Regarding the fraud penalty, the court relied on *Aaron Hirschman, 12 T. C. 1223*, holding that filing an amended return does not eliminate the fraudulent nature of the original return. The court found Berger's actions indicative of an intent to evade tax. On depreciation, the court cited *Copifyer Lithograph Corporation, 12 T. C. 728*, stating that increased usage alone does not warrant accelerated depreciation without proof of shortened useful life. The court accepted the stock issuance as valid equity invested capital since it was issued for unpaid salaries, which were reported as income by the recipients.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that corporations are not automatically liable for the unauthorized and illegal actions of their officers. The key is whether the corporation authorized, participated in, or benefited from the actions. It also reinforces the principle that filing an amended tax return does not negate the consequences of a fraudulent original return. This case serves as a reminder that corporate officers engaging in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

illegal side deals may face personal liability, even if they are acting in their capacity as officers. The ruling also has implications for proving accelerated depreciation, requiring taxpayers to demonstrate a shortened useful life of assets, not just increased usage.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.