Sodbar Co. v. Commissioner, 14 T.C. 1266 (1950)

This case clarifies the factors used to determine reasonable compensation for officer-stockholders and the computation of net abnormal income attributable to research and development for excess profits tax relief under Section 721(a)(2)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

Sodbar Co. sought relief from excess profits taxes, claiming its income was abnormally high due to research and development efforts. The Tax Court addressed the reasonableness of officer-stockholders' salaries, the determination of net abnormal income attributable to research and development, and the deductibility of certain business expenses. The court found the salaries partially excessive, acknowledged the company's research and development efforts, adjusted the net abnormal income calculation, and allowed a deduction for travel and commission expenses. It clarified the method for computing net abnormal income, emphasizing the importance of considering direct costs and expenses, as well as adjustments to net sales.

Facts

Sodbar Co. engaged in research and development during the base period, leading to a principal product. The company paid salaries to its officer-stockholders. The Commissioner challenged the reasonableness of these salaries and the computation of net abnormal income for excess profits tax purposes. A renegotiation rebate impacted the net sales figure. The company also incurred travel and commission expenses.

Procedural History

Sodbar Co. petitioned the Tax Court to review the Commissioner's determination regarding excess profits taxes. The Tax Court considered evidence and arguments related to officer salaries, net abnormal income calculation, and business expense deductions. The court issued a decision based on its findings of fact and application of relevant legal principles.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the salaries paid to petitioner's officer-stockholders were reasonable.
2. Whether petitioner engaged in research and development during the base period.
3. How to compute the net abnormal income realized which is attributable to other years.
4. Whether a portion of income from the developed product should be attributed to manufacturing and sales activities.
5. Whether business improvement factors should be applied to abnormal income

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

versus net abnormal income.
6. Whether $4,000 in travel and commission expenses were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Holding

1. No, because the payments made were excessive, although the Commissioner's determination was too drastic.
2. Yes, because the petitioner did engage in research and development during the base period.
3. The net abnormal income should be computed by deducting direct costs and expenses and adjusting the net sales figure, including the renegotiation rebate, because these items affect the ultimate figures.
4. No, because the Commissioner's presentation of the case precludes such attribution under the specific facts presented.
5. No, because the business improvement factors should be applied to net abnormal income, not abnormal income.
6. Yes, because the payment was substantiated by testimony and there was no rebuttal evidence.

Court's Reasoning

The court determined the reasonableness of salaries based on multiple factors, including prior salaries, duties performed, increased business demands, company success, and dividend history, citing *J. J. Hart, Inc.*, 9 T. C. 135, 140. It found that Sodbar Co. engaged in research and development, relying on *W. B. Knight Machinery Co.*, 6 T. C. 519, and *Keystone Brass Works*, 12 T. C. 618. Regarding net abnormal income, the court held that

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.