Albina Marine Iron Works, Inc. v. Commissioner, 1953 T.C. 141 (1953)

A taxpayer cannot accrue and deduct a contested tax liability until the contest is resolved, and a taxpayer cannot include in inventory items to which it does not hold title.

Summary

Albina Marine Iron Works sought to deduct accrued Oregon excise taxes and interest expenses related to a disallowed deduction for post-war reconversion expenses. The Tax Court held that Albina could not deduct the contested tax until the contest was resolved. Additionally, Albina attempted to reduce its closing inventory by writing down the value of work in progress on government contracts, anticipating future losses. The court disallowed this, stating Albina did not hold title to the materials and could not deduct unrealized losses.

Facts

Albina Marine Iron Works, Inc. (Albina) was constructing harbor tugs and lighters for the government under Contracts 1847 and 1964. Albina claimed a deduction for "Post-war Reconversion Expense" on its Oregon excise tax return, which was later disallowed. Albina also attempted to value its work in progress on uncompleted vessels at a "market" value significantly lower than the actual cost of materials and labor. Under the terms of the contracts, the government supplied the materials, and Albina was prohibited from insuring the vessels or assigning the contract.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against Albina for the fiscal years ended May 31, 1944, and May 31, 1945. Albina petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court addressed the deductibility of the Oregon excise tax, interest expenses, and the valuation of Albina's closing inventory.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Albina could accrue and deduct additional Oregon excise taxes for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1944, resulting from the disallowance of the post-war reconversion expense deduction.

2. Whether Albina could deduct interest on deficiencies in Federal income and excess profits tax for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1945, arising from the disallowance of the same post-war reconversion expense deduction.

3. Whether Albina could reduce its closing inventory for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1945, by writing down the value of work in progress on government contracts below cost.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because Albina contested the additional tax by claiming the deduction, preventing accrual until the amended return was filed.

2. No, because Albina did not accrue the interest expense on its books, nor had it conceded liability for the tax deficiencies during that fiscal year.

3. No, because Albina did not hold title to the materials and was attempting to deduct unrealized losses.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that a tax liability can only be accrued when all events fixing the amount of the tax and the taxpayer's liability have occurred. Citing *Dixie Pine Products Co. v. Commissioner* and *Security Flour Mills Co. v. Commissioner*, the court emphasized the "contested tax" rule, stating accrual must be postponed until the liability is finally determined. Even without legal proceedings, a "contest" exists if the taxpayer denies liability. The court noted, "In our view, it is sufficient if the taxpayer does not accrue the items on its books and denies its liability therefor." Regarding the inventory, the court noted that under Section 22(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Commissioner has authority over inventory methods, and Regulations 111, section 29.22(c)-1 requires the taxpayer to hold title to the merchandise. Because Albina did not hold title to the materials used in constructing the vessels, it could not include them in its inventory. The court concluded that Albina's attempt to write down the inventory was an effort to deduct unrealized losses, which is prohibited under revenue laws, citing *Weiss v. Wiener* and *Lucas v. American Code Co*.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the application of the "contested tax" rule and the requirements for inventory valuation. It reinforces that taxpayers cannot accrue contested tax liabilities until the contest is resolved and provides guidance on what constitutes a "contest." It also highlights the importance of title in determining inventory inclusion, particularly in government contract settings. Businesses should carefully consider ownership when determining what can be included in inventory. The case serves as a reminder that tax deductions are generally limited to realized losses, and attempts to anticipate future losses through inventory write-downs may be disallowed. This case has been cited in subsequent cases regarding the accrual of tax liabilities and inventory valuation methods.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.