Frank Cuneo, Inc. v. Commissioner, 19 T.C. 1269 (1953)

A prolonged period of intense price competition within an industry, lasting for several years, is not considered a 'temporary' economic circumstance that would qualify a taxpayer for excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

Frank Cuneo, Inc., a waste paper processing firm, sought excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, arguing that a price war in Cleveland depressed its business during the base period years (1936-1939). The Tax Court denied the relief, finding that the intense competition, while impacting Cuneo's profits, was neither temporary nor unusual, as it had persisted for approximately eleven years. The court emphasized that active competition is a normal business factor and that Cuneo's overall performance during the base period, despite the competition, did not demonstrate an inadequate standard of normal earnings.

Facts

Frank Cuneo, Inc. collected and processed waste paper in Cleveland, Ohio. From 1929 to 1940, the waste paper industry in Cleveland experienced intense price competition, primarily driven by National, a competitor seeking to increase its market share. This competition involved offering higher prices to suppliers of waste paper. Cuneo argued this "price war" depressed its earnings during the base period years of 1936-1939, entitling it to excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

Frank Cuneo, Inc. applied for excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the application. Cuneo then petitioned the Tax Court for review of the Commissioner's decision. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's disallowance.

Issue(s)

Whether the intense price competition experienced by Frank Cuneo, Inc. in the waste paper industry in Cleveland during the base period years constituted a "temporary economic circumstance unusual" to the taxpayer, thereby entitling it to excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the evidence did not establish that the price competition was a "temporary economic circumstance unusual" to Frank Cuneo, Inc., as it had

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

persisted for approximately eleven years and was considered a regular and expected occurrence in the Cleveland waste paper market. The Tax Court therefore held that the Commissioner was correct in refusing to allow Cuneo's claim for relief under Section 722(b)(2).

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that while regulations recognize a ruinous price war as a potential basis for relief under Section 722(b)(2), active competition is a normal business factor and cannot be considered temporary or unusual. The court emphasized that the alleged price war had been ongoing since 1929. The Court stated: "It is difficult to see how conditions under which an industry, or a segment of an industry, has been operating for 11 years can be characterized as temporary and unusual." The court noted that Cuneo's business was more profitable during the base period than in some prior years when the alleged price war was also in effect. The court also noted that the intense price competition was a "regular and expected occurrence in Cleveland during those years; that it was not temporary and unusual." Therefore, Cuneo failed to demonstrate that its average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to a temporary economic circumstance.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the interpretation of "temporary economic circumstances unusual" under Section 722(b)(2) for excess profits tax relief. It establishes that long-standing competitive pressures, even if intense, are unlikely to qualify as temporary. Attorneys advising businesses seeking tax relief must demonstrate that the adverse economic conditions were genuinely temporary and unusual, deviating significantly from the company's typical business environment. The duration and predictability of the circumstances are critical factors. Later cases would cite this decision to distinguish between normal competitive pressures and truly temporary economic disruptions when evaluating claims for tax relief. This ruling highlights the importance of documenting the specific nature and duration of the alleged economic hardship to support a claim for tax relief.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.