Ohmer Corp. v. Commissioner, 8 T.C. 522 (1947)

Even with procedural irregularities in a renegotiation process, a tax court can still have jurisdiction to determine excessive profits if an order determining excessive profits was entered and notice was given.

Summary

Ohmer Corporation (Petitioner) disputed the Tax Court's jurisdiction over its 1945 excessive profits, arguing procedural defects in the renegotiation process. The Tax Court held that despite irregularities like an unsigned notice and consolidated renegotiation without explicit consent, the court still had jurisdiction because a determination of excessive profits was made and notice given to the petitioner. The petitioner waived these defects by filing a petition that didn't initially question the notice itself. The case was restored to the calendar for a hearing on the remaining issues.

Facts

Ohmer Register Company was succeeded by Ohmer Corporation (the Petitioner).
The Renegotiation order and notice referred to "Ohmer Register Company — and Ohmer Corporation, Successor."
The renegotiation process included the Petitioner providing information and communicating with renegotiators.
Ohmer Register Company was never formally assigned for renegotiation nor notified of its commencement.
Neither company expressly consented to consolidated renegotiation.

Procedural History

The War Contracts Price Adjustment Board initiated renegotiation proceedings concerning the petitioner's 1945 profits.
The petitioner challenged the Tax Court's jurisdiction, alleging defects in the renegotiation process.
The Tax Court considered whether these defects deprived it of jurisdiction to determine the excessive profits.

Issue(s)

Whether procedural irregularities in the renegotiation process, such as an unsigned notice, lack of formal assignment for renegotiation of one entity, and absence of express consent to consolidated renegotiation, deprive the Tax Court of jurisdiction to determine the excessive profits of the petitioner.

Holding

No, because once an order has been entered determining that the profits of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

petitioner were excessive and notice given, the Tax Court acquires jurisdiction, under the circumstances, to determine the excessive profits, if any, of the petitioner for 1945. The petitioner has the opportunity to challenge the correct amount regardless of what errors were committed during the renegotiation. Further, the petitioner waived any defect in the notice by filing a petition which in no way questioned the notice.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the renegotiation was "of the petitioner." It was the corporation "assigned" for renegotiation, it furnished information to the renegotiators, and it was notified that renegotiation of its contracts and subcontracts had "commenced."
Even though the notice was unsigned and the designation "Ohmer Register Company — and Ohmer Corporation, Successor" was awkward, these omissions or deficiencies do not prevent the Tax Court from acquiring jurisdiction, under the circumstances, to determine the excessive profits, if any, of the petitioner for 1945.
The court emphasized that the statute does not require a signed notice, citing *Oswego Falls Corp., 26 B. T. A. 60, affd. 71 F. 2d 673*, and the regulations allow leeway in the notice's form.
Furthermore, by filing the petition without initially questioning the notice, the petitioner waived any defect in the notice.
The court stated: "The petitioner has this opportunity to show the correct amount regardless of what errors were committed in the course of the renegotiation once an order has been entered determining that the profits of the petitioner were excessive and notice given."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that while procedural correctness in renegotiation is preferred, minor defects will not automatically strip a tax court of jurisdiction.
Parties challenging renegotiation determinations must promptly raise objections to procedural flaws to avoid waiving them.
The ruling emphasizes that the key requirements for jurisdiction are a determination of excessive profits and adequate notice to the affected party.
Subsequent cases will likely focus on whether the notice was indeed effective in informing the party of the determination, irrespective of minor formal defects.
This case demonstrates that courts may prioritize substance over form, particularly when a party has actively participated in the process and has been made aware of the determination against them.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.