Swift & Co. v. Commissioner, 17 T.C. 1269 (1952)

A taxpayer's accounting period for tax purposes must align with the method of accounting regularly employed in keeping their books; the Commissioner cannot impose a fiscal year basis if the taxpayer's books are clearly kept on a calendar year basis.

Summary

Swift & Co. was incorporated in October 1945 and filed its first tax return for the fiscal year ending November 30, 1946. The Commissioner determined deficiencies based on this fiscal year. However, Swift & Co. argued that its books were maintained on a calendar year basis, closing annually on December 31st due to Interstate Commerce Commission regulations. The Tax Court held that the deficiencies were incorrectly determined on a fiscal year basis because the company's books were demonstrably kept on a calendar year basis, regardless of the initially filed return or audit reports.

Facts

- Swift & Co. was incorporated in October 1945.
- The company filed its first tax return for the fiscal year ending November 30, 1946.
- The Commissioner determined deficiencies based on the fiscal year ending November 30th.
- Swift & Co.'s books were closed annually on December 31st, aligning with Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) regulations.
- Annual audit reports were assembled to prepare tax returns.

Procedural History

- The Commissioner assessed deficiencies based on a fiscal year accounting period.
- Swift & Co. contested the deficiencies, arguing for a calendar year basis.
- The Tax Court reviewed the case to determine the appropriate accounting period.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Commissioner can assess deficiencies based on a fiscal year accounting period when the taxpayer's books are maintained on a calendar year basis.

Holding

1. No, because under Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code, the net income shall be computed based on the taxpayer's annual accounting period in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

accordance with the method of accounting regularly employed in keeping the books, and Swift & Co.’s books were maintained on a calendar year basis.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code requires the tax return to be based on the method of accounting regularly employed in keeping the books. The court found that Swift & Co.’s books were closed at the end of the calendar year, December 31st, regardless of the first tax return being filed on a fiscal year basis or the creation of annual audit reports. The court stated, “Based upon the books of account themselves and the date as of which they were customarily closed out and the balances transferred, petitioner’s accounting period was manifestly brought to a close only once each year and that was on December 31st.” The court distinguished between the books of account and the audit reports, emphasizing that the reports were not part of the books themselves and did not override the clear calendar-year accounting system. The court cited *Helvering v. Brooklyn City R. Co.*, stating that a taxpayer has no election to change the period of the return if it doesn’t align with the books.

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes that tax accounting must follow actual bookkeeping practices. It clarifies that the initial filing of a return on a particular basis does not necessarily lock the taxpayer into that accounting period if their books clearly reflect a different method. This decision cautions the IRS against imposing accounting periods that contradict a taxpayer’s established and consistent bookkeeping methods. Subsequent cases must analyze the actual books and records of the taxpayer to determine the appropriate accounting period. The presence of audit reports or other ancillary documents does not override the accounting method reflected in the books themselves. This impacts how businesses organize their finances and file taxes, and how tax professionals advise their clients. The case reinforces the importance of accurate and consistent record-keeping to support the chosen tax accounting method.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.