

## ***15 T.C. 247 (1950)***

An accrual basis taxpayer must recognize income when all events have occurred that fix the right to receive it and the amount can be determined with reasonable accuracy.

### **Summary**

H. O. Boehme, Inc. sought a determination from the Tax Court regarding the proper tax year for including refunds of New York State franchise taxes in its income. The refunds stemmed from the renegotiation of the company's war contracts in 1943 and 1944. The court held that the credit related to the 1943 renegotiation was properly accruable in 1944, as all necessary factors were known by the end of that year. However, the credit or refund linked to the 1944 renegotiation was accruable in 1945, since the final determination of excessive profits occurred in October of that year.

### **Facts**

H. O. Boehme, Inc., a New York corporation, manufactured mechanical and electrical equipment. The company kept its books on an accrual basis. In 1944, the company executed a renegotiation agreement with the Price Adjustment Board regarding excessive profits for 1943. As a result, the company applied for a refund of New York State franchise taxes, which it received in 1945. In 1945, a similar renegotiation agreement was reached for 1944 profits. A subsequent refund was received in 1946.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the petitioner's excess profits tax for 1945. The petitioner disputed the determination, arguing that the tax refunds should have been included in its 1944 income. The case was brought before the Tax Court to resolve the dispute.

### **Issue(s)**

Whether refunds of New York State franchise taxes, resulting from the renegotiation of petitioner's 1943 and 1944 income, should be included in its income for the year 1944 or 1945.

### **Holding**

1. Yes, the refund related to the 1943 renegotiation is includible in the taxpayer's 1944 income because all factors necessary to determine the credit were known by the end of 1944.
2. No, the refund related to the 1944 renegotiation is not includible in the taxpayer's

1944 income because the final determination of excessive profits was not made until October 17, 1945; thus, it is properly accruable in 1945.

### **Court's Reasoning**

The court relied on the established principle that an accrual basis taxpayer must recognize income when all events have occurred that fix the right to receive the income and the amount can be determined with reasonable accuracy. The court stated, "It is now well established that if at the close of the taxable year an accrual basis taxpayer has all of the basic data or facts from which he may within reasonable limits determine an amount which he has a fixed right to receive, such amount is accruable."

Applying this principle to the facts, the court found that by the end of 1944, the taxpayer knew its 1943 net income after renegotiation and was entitled to a credit under New York law. Therefore, the refund related to the 1943 income was properly accruable in 1944. However, with respect to the 1944 income, the final determination of excessive profits was not made until October 17, 1945. Thus, all the elements necessary to ascertain the amount of the credit were not known at the end of 1944, and the refund was properly accruable in 1945.

### **Practical Implications**

This case provides a clear example of how the "all events test" applies to accrual basis taxpayers in the context of tax refunds. It emphasizes the importance of identifying the specific point in time when all factors necessary to determine the amount of a refund or credit are known with reasonable accuracy. This case informs legal reasoning by providing a fact pattern to compare to when determining when income must be recognized for tax purposes for accrual based taxpayers. This applies not only to tax refunds but any situation where the amount of payment depends on a later event.