19 T.C. 1277 (1953)

The term “common control” under the Renegotiation Act encompasses actual control, not merely legally enforceable control, and exists when the same individuals or families have the power to direct the management and policies of multiple entities, even if that power is not actively exercised.

Summary

Jenks & Muir Manufacturing Co. argued it was exempt from renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act because its renegotiable profits were less than $500,000. The Tax Court considered whether Jenks & Muir was “under common control” with Nichols & Co., whose renegotiable sales exceeded $500,000. The court found that the Nichols, Wellman, and Hackett families had the power to control both entities, even if they didn’t actively exercise it. The court thus held that Jenks & Muir was subject to renegotiation. The decision emphasized the intent of Congress to prevent the division of renegotiable business among family members or related organizations.

Facts

Nichols & Co., Inc., was owned and controlled by the Nichols, Wellman, and Hackett families. These families also furnished the capital for Jenks & Muir, a partnership. The general partners of Jenks & Muir were officers of Providence, another company owned by the same families. The limited partners of Jenks & Muir could terminate the partnership at will. Jenks & Muir’s business was located in a small room within Providence’s premises. Jenks & Muir was formed due to questions regarding the renegotiation of Alexander and Providence, to prevent abandoning the grease extraction business.

Procedural History

Jenks & Muir Manufacturing Co. petitioned the Tax Court, arguing it was exempt from renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued that Jenks & Muir was under common control with Nichols & Co., making it subject to renegotiation. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether Jenks & Muir Manufacturing Co. was “under common control” with Nichols & Co., Inc., within the meaning of Section 403(c)(6) of the Renegotiation Act, thereby making it subject to renegotiation despite its profits being less than $500,000.

Holding

Yes, because the Nichols, Wellman, and Hackett families had the power to control

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

both Nichols & Co. and Jenks & Muir, satisfying the “common control” requirement under the Renegotiation Act, even if they didn’t actively exercise that control.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that “actual control, and not legally enforceable control, is the proper test under the Renegotiation Act.” The court examined the facts and found that the Nichols, Wellman, and Hackett families could control both Nichols & Co. and Jenks & Muir at all times. The court emphasized that the power of control, rather than its actual exercise, was the critical element under the statute. The court noted the intent of Congress to prevent the division of a business otherwise subject to renegotiation among members of one family or organization. The organization of different companies by members of the same families demonstrated an intent to control them, which the court could not overlook. The court held that Nichols and Jenks & Muir were under actual common control within the meaning of Section 403(c)(6) of the Renegotiation Act.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the definition of “common control” under the Renegotiation Act, emphasizing that actual control, rather than legally enforceable control, is the key factor. It demonstrates that family relationships and the ability to influence business decisions can establish common control, even without formal legal mechanisms. This ruling has implications for how businesses are structured to avoid renegotiation or other regulatory oversight. Later cases would likely consider this ruling when evaluating whether nominally separate entities are in fact under common control due to overlapping ownership or management by related parties. It emphasizes that courts will scrutinize the substance of relationships, not just the legal form, to determine control.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.