Glenshaw Glass Co., 13 T.C. 296 (1949)

Royalty payments made under a contract are not considered payments attributable to a decree against the taxpayer, even if a fraudulent injunction influenced the decision to maintain the contract; additionally, the determination of reasonable compensation for executives in one tax year does not necessarily dictate the outcome in subsequent years if factual circumstances have changed.

Summary

Glenshaw Glass Co. sought to increase its excess profits tax credit by restoring royalty payments made to Hartford-Empire Co. during the base period, arguing these payments were attributable to a fraudulently induced decree and were abnormal deductions. The Tax Court held that royalty payments made under a contract, even if influenced by a fraudulent injunction, were not payments attributable to a decree. Additionally, the court addressed the deductibility of executive compensation, finding that prior determinations of reasonableness were not binding in subsequent tax years due to changes in factual circumstances. The court found the compensation was reasonable.

Facts

Glenshaw Glass Co. made royalty payments to Hartford-Empire Co. during the base period years under an existing contract. Glenshaw argued that but for a court injunction, it would have terminated the contract and used Shawkee feeders, avoiding royalty payments. The injunction was later found to have been procured by fraud. In 1943 and 1944, Glenshaw paid bonuses to its executives under a plan similar to one in 1942, which had been previously determined to be unreasonable compensation. The Commissioner disallowed portions of the compensation expense.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in Glenshaw's excess profits tax for 1943 and 1944. The Tax Court addressed the deductibility of royalty payments and executive compensation. A prior Tax Court decision regarding executive compensation for 1942 was affirmed by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals and certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether royalty payments during the base period years were attributable to the fraudulently induced decree and were abnormal deductions for petitioner and should, therefore, be restored to petitioner's base period income?

2. Whether respondent erred in disallowing certain compensation paid by petitioner to three of its officers?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the royalty payments were made under a contract, not in discharge of a liability imposed by a judgment or decree, except for $11,020.90 paid pursuant to the final decree.

2. No, the Commissioner erred in disallowing the compensation, because the salaries paid were for services rendered and were not a distribution of profits.

Court’s Reasoning

Regarding the royalty payments, the court reasoned that payments made under a contract, even if the contract was maintained due to a fraudulent injunction, were not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.