Cohen v. Commissioner, 17 T.C. 13 (1951)

The Renegotiation Act allows the government to recoup excessive profits earned by contractors during wartime, and profits can be allocated to specific periods based on performance, regardless of the contractor's accounting method.

Summary

This case concerns the renegotiation of profits earned by Nathan Cohen, a contractor, during World War II. The Tax Court addressed whether amounts accrued but not received by Cohen in 1943 and 1944 could be renegotiated in 1945 under Section 403(h) of the Renegotiation Act. The court held that the amended statute authorized renegotiation in 1945 of amounts earned in prior years but not received until after the termination date, December 31, 1945, as the profits were reasonably allocable to performance prior to that date.

Facts

Nathan Cohen, a contractor, earned commissions from Whitin Machine Works. In 1943 and 1944, Whitin accrued commissions payable to Cohen, but Cohen deferred receiving these payments. Cohen reported his income on a cash basis. The War Contracts Price Adjustment Board sought to renegotiate Cohen's profits for those years and for 1945. The core dispute was whether the deferred commissions, not received until after December 31, 1945, could be included in renegotiable income for 1945.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined that Cohen had excessive profits subject to renegotiation. Cohen appealed to the Tax Court, contesting the inclusion of the accrued but unpaid commissions in his 1945 renegotiable income and arguing the statute of limitations had expired. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether amounts accrued to Cohen in 1943 and 1944 but not received until after the termination date of December 31, 1945, could be renegotiated in 1945 under Section 403(h) of the Renegotiation Act.
2. Whether renegotiation of profits in 1945 was barred by the statute of limitations provided in section 403(c)(3) of the Act.

Holding

1. Yes, because Section 403(h) applies to profits "reasonably allocable to performance prior to the close of the termination date," and the amounts were earned in 1943 and 1944.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because Section 403(h), as amended, for the first time empowered the respondent, without the consent of petitioner, to treat the amounts as received by petitioner for renegotiation purposes, and the amounts were includible only after the amendment and then were allocated to 1945.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 403(h), as amended, allowed for the renegotiation of profits reasonably allocable to performance before the termination date, regardless of the contractor's accounting method. The court emphasized that the profits were earned in 1943 and 1944, making their allocation to 1945 reasonable. The court considered the legislative history of Section 403(h), noting that the amendment aimed to give the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board flexibility in handling income items. The court stated that, "* * * this amendment confers upon the Board broad discretionary power in determining items of income which fall within the scope of the act * *". Cohen's voluntary act of postponing payment made his accounting method unusual for renegotiation. The court dismissed Cohen's statute of limitations argument, holding that the relevant period began when Section 403(h) empowered the government to treat the amounts as received.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the scope and application of the Renegotiation Act, particularly Section 403(h), as amended. It demonstrates that the government has broad authority to renegotiate profits earned during wartime, even if those profits are received after the formal termination date of the Act. This case serves as a reminder to contractors that the substance of their economic activity and performance, rather than their chosen accounting method, will determine whether their profits are subject to renegotiation. It also underscores the principle that contractors cannot avoid renegotiation by voluntarily deferring income recognition. Later cases would cite Cohen when dealing with similar questions of proper allocation of costs and revenues in government contracting.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.