Fallon Brewing Co. v. Commissioner, 17 T.C. 1058 (1951)

The national prohibition of beer, while impactful, was not a 'temporary' or 'unusual' economic event that would qualify a brewery for excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

Fallon Brewing Company sought relief from excess profits tax under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, arguing that national prohibition depressed the brewing industry and that a shift towards packaged beer sales constituted a change in the character of its business. The Tax Court denied the relief, holding that national prohibition was not a 'temporary economic event' or an 'unusual' event and that the company's shift to packaged beer sales did not fundamentally change the character of its business. The court emphasized that the brewing industry had faced prohibition-related challenges before and that the shift to packaged beer was a normal adaptation to consumer demand.

Facts

Fallon Brewing Co. produced near beer and soda beverages until April 7, 1933, when it began brewing and selling beer. Fallon argued that the brewing industry was depressed during the base period years (1936-1939) due to the lingering effects of national prohibition under the Volstead Act. Fallon also claimed a 'change in character' of its business, specifically a shift from primarily draught beer sales to packaged beer sales, supported by an advertising program beginning in 1933 that resulted in packaged beer sales growing from 25% of total sales in 1933 to 80% in 1939.

Procedural History

Fallon Brewing Co. applied for relief from excess profits tax under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, which was denied by the Commissioner. Fallon then petitioned the Tax Court for review of the Commissioner's decision. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's denial.

Issue(s)

1. Whether national prohibition under the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act constituted a 'temporary economic event unusual' to the brewing industry under Section 722(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether Fallon's shift from draught beer sales to packaged beer sales constituted a 'change in the character of the business' under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act were not 'temporary' events, as they were intended to last for an indeterminate period. Furthermore, prohibition, even if impactful, was not 'unusual' considering the industry's history of dealing with increasing state-level prohibition laws. The court stated that "neither the legislative event of national prohibition in January, 1920, nor the resulting economic consequences constituted a temporary economic event unusual in the brewing industry or the business of petitioner, within the meaning of section 722 (b) (2)."
2. No, because the shift to packaged beer sales was a natural adaptation to consumer demand and did not fundamentally alter the business's general character. Fallon used the same brewing plant and bottling facilities throughout the period. "We conclude that there was no such change as envisaged by subsection (b) (4), supra, for there was no departure from the general character of the petitioner's beer business."

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the Eighteenth Amendment, a change to the Constitution, was intended to be permanent and therefore not a 'temporary' event. The court also found that the brewing industry had faced increasing prohibition measures before national prohibition, making the event not 'unusual.' Regarding the shift to packaged beer sales, the court emphasized that Fallon had merely adapted to consumer demand without changing the fundamental character of its business. The court distinguished between changes in degree (increased packaged sales) and changes in kind (a fundamental shift in the business model), finding only the former. The court also noted that Fallon's percentage of packaged sales was less than the percentage of packaged sales of all California breweries during the relevant period.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the interpretation of 'temporary' and 'unusual' events in the context of Section 722 relief. It shows that events of great impact and duration, even if eventually reversed, may not qualify as 'temporary' if they were intended to be permanent at their inception. It also demonstrates that a business's adaptation to market trends, such as shifting sales strategies, does not necessarily constitute a change in the 'character' of the business for tax relief purposes. This case informs how courts should analyze claims for excess profits tax relief, requiring a showing of genuine and fundamental changes in business operations, not simply adaptations to market conditions, and only truly 'temporary' and 'unusual' economic conditions qualify.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.