C.J. Hug Company, 8 T.C. 630 (1947)

r
r

Actual control of a corporation, for purposes of the Renegotiation Act of 1943, can be established through evidence of pervasive influence over the corporation's operations, management, and finances, even without direct majority stock ownership.

r
r

Summary

r

The Tax Court addressed whether C.J. Hug Company was subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act of 1943. The IRS argued that C.J. Hug, through his pervasive control over the company's operations and finances, placed the company under "common control" with other entities he controlled, exceeding the Act's threshold for renegotiation. The court found that despite Hug not having majority stock ownership for a portion of the year, his actual control over the company's operations, board, and assets subjected the company to renegotiation. The court emphasized that "control" under the act is not solely determined by stock ownership but also by factual evidence of influence.

r
r

Facts

r

r
C.J. Hug was the president and general manager of C.J. Hug Company from its inception in 1922 through 1945.r
Hug owned the largest amount of the company's stock at various times and acquired majority ownership in May 1945.r
Even before holding a majority of stock, Hug controlled stockholder meetings through his voting units and proxies.r
The company was in default from late 1941 through 1945, giving new stockholders and noteholders the right to elect four of seven directors, but they never exercised this right.r
In February 1945, the company resolved to dissolve at Hug's direction and to transfer contracts to him without consideration.r
The board of directors authorized the assignment of a contract to Hug and decided

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to take on no new work, signaling the end of the company's war contract work.r
Hug borrowed $300,000 from the company in January 1945 for personal use, representing a significant portion of its assets.r
He then began buying up the company's stock.r

r
r

Procedural History

r

r
The Commissioner determined that C.J. Hug Company was subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act of 1943.r
The company petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination.r

r
r

Issue(s)

r

r
Whether C.J. Hug controlled C.J. Hug Company within the meaning of section 403(c)(6) of the Renegotiation Act of 1943 during the fiscal year 1945, making the company subject to renegotiation.r

r
r

Holding

r

Yes, because Hug controlled the company through his pervasive influence over its operations, board of directors, stockholder meetings, and assets, even before he obtained majority stock ownership.

r
r

Court's Reasoning

r

r

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court reasoned that the Renegotiation Act does not define “control” solely based on stock ownership. It found that Hug exerted actual control over the company in several ways:r
r
He controlled stockholder meetings through his voting units and proxies.r
He influenced the board of directors, as evidenced by their decisions regarding contract assignments and company dissolution.r
He used the company’s assets for his personal benefit by borrowing a large sum without proper authorization.r
r
The court noted that the new stockholders’ failure to exercise their right to elect directors did not negate Hug’s control. The resolution to dissolve the company at Hug’s direction further demonstrated his influence. The court stated, “Since Hug controlled the meetings of the petitioner’s stockholders, controlled petitioner’s board of directors, and controlled petitioner’s operations and assets to the extent here shown, we conclude that he was in actual control of the petitioner at all times during 1945 prior to July 14, 1945, after which date he was concededly in control by reason of his stock ownership.”r

r
r

Practical Implications

r

r
This case establishes that

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.