Pittsburgh Brewing Co. v. Commissioner, 37 T.C. 505 (1961)

A court must apply the clear and unambiguous language of a tax statute as written, even if the result appears harsh or inequitable in specific circumstances.

Summary

Pittsburgh Brewing Company (PBC) purchased all the stock of Impervious Varnish Co. The Commissioner determined that this stock acquisition constituted a capital reduction under Section 713(g)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code, thus decreasing PBC's excess profits credit. PBC argued that the statute should be interpreted in light of Congressional intent to prevent duplication of excess profits credit, which didn't occur here. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination, holding that the statute's language was clear and unambiguous and must be applied as written, regardless of potential hardship.

Facts

- Pittsburgh Brewing Co. (PBC) manufactured paints and chemicals.
- Impervious Varnish Co. manufactured paints, lacquers, and varnish.
- PBC borrowed $210,000 and used $207,624.75 to purchase all outstanding stock of Impervious Varnish Co.
- PBC computed its excess profits credit based on income, while Impervious Varnish Co. computed its credit based on invested capital.

Procedural History

- The Commissioner determined deficiencies in PBC's excess profits taxes for fiscal years ending September 30, 1944, 1945, and 1946.
- PBC petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the acquisition by PBC of 100% of Impervious Varnish Co.'s stock constituted a capital reduction within the meaning of Section 713(g)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether Section 713(g)(5) applies only to changes in a company's capital stock or extends to the broader concept of capital assets.
3. Whether, if the stock acquisition constitutes a capital reduction, the reduction should be limited to 50% of the stock's cost, given that ownership of 50% or less of a company's stock is treated as excluded capital.

Holding

1. Yes, because the language of Section 713(g)(5) is clear and unambiguous, requiring the stock acquisition to be treated as a capital reduction.
2. The term "capital" in Section 713(g)(5) refers to the broader concept of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

corporate assets used in the business, not merely the company's capital stock.
3. No, because the statute does not provide for computing the capital reduction based on any percentage of the adjusted cost basis of shares held in excess of the number constituting control; it specifies how the capital reduction is computed when control exists.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 713(g)(5) clearly prescribed what constitutes a reduction of capital for computing the excess profits credit. While acknowledging that the Congressional purpose might have included preventing duplication of excess profits credit, the court stated that the statute did not explicitly limit itself to that purpose. The court emphasized the importance of construing a statute as a whole, in light of the purposes for which the Excess Profits Tax Act was enacted, citing *Alexander v. Cosden Pipe Line Co.*, 290 U.S. 484, 496 and *Helvering v. New York Trust Co.*, 292 U.S. 455. Even if the literal application of the statute resulted in hardship, the court held that it could not "sacrifice the plain, obvious and rational meaning of the statute," quoting *Deputy v. duPont*, 308 U.S. 488, 498. The court also rejected the argument that "capital" only meant capital stock, stating that it designates the portion of corporate assets used to conduct business and derive profits.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the principle that courts will generally adhere to the plain language of tax statutes, even if the outcome seems unfair or inconsistent with broader policy objectives. This ruling reinforces the need for careful planning and consideration of the specific language of tax laws when structuring business transactions. It serves as a reminder that taxpayers cannot rely solely on perceived Congressional intent if the statutory language clearly dictates a different result. Later cases involving similar excess profits tax issues have cited this case for the proposition that clear statutory language prevails over arguments about underlying legislative purpose. It also highlights the importance of understanding definitions of key terms, such as

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.