Rossum Brothers, Inc. v. Commissioner, 16 T.C. 1041 (1951)

To qualify for excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, a taxpayer must demonstrate a firm commitment, predating January 1, 1940, to a course of action resulting in a change in the capacity for production or operation of its business.

Summary

Rossum Brothers, Inc. sought excess profits tax relief, arguing that the acquisition of a printing press and lift constituted a change in its business character due to increased production capacity. The company claimed it committed to purchasing the machinery in 1939, entitling it to relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court denied the relief, finding insufficient evidence to prove a firm commitment to the purchase before January 1, 1940. Conflicting testimony and inconsistent documentation undermined the taxpayer's claim.

Facts

Rossum Brothers, Inc. claimed it decided to purchase a 6/0 Miehle press and Berry Lift in 1939 to handle increased business from Rockwood and Company. The company presented testimony from its officers and the general manager of Weinstein Co. (the seller) to support the claim that an oral order was placed in August 1939. However, a letter from Weinstein Co. in 1943 indicated the purchase occurred in early 1940, contradicting the taxpayer's assertion. The records of Weinstein Co. were destroyed in 1950.

Procedural History

Rossum Brothers, Inc. petitioned the Tax Court for relief from excess profits tax. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue opposed the petition. The Tax Court reviewed the evidence and arguments presented by both sides.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Rossum Brothers, Inc. demonstrated a commitment prior to January 1, 1940, to a course of action that resulted in a change in the capacity for production or operation of its business, thus entitling it to relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the evidence presented was inconsistent and failed to convincingly demonstrate a firm commitment to purchase the machinery before January 1, 1940.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Tax Court found the evidence presented by Rossum Brothers, Inc. unconvincing. The court noted inconsistencies between the testimony of witnesses, conflicting statements in letters from Weinstein Co. (the seller), and discrepancies between allegations in the petition and statements made in correspondence. Specifically, the court highlighted the conflicting letters from Weinstein Co., one stating the purchase occurred in early 1940 and the other claiming a sale date of December 30, 1939. The court questioned the reliability of the testimony, particularly that of Davis, the Weinstein Co. manager, whose recollection was based on a letter written years after the events in question. The court also emphasized that no records from Miehle Co. or Berry Co. were presented to corroborate the taxpayer's claim. The court stated, "We conclude from all of the evidence that petitioner has failed to show that it was committed prior to January 1, 1940, to a course of action for a change in the capacity for production or operation of its business…"

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of clear, consistent, and documented evidence when claiming tax relief based on business changes. Taxpayers must demonstrate a concrete commitment to a course of action before a specific date to qualify for relief. This requires more than mere inquiries or preliminary discussions; a binding agreement or decisive action must be proven. The decision also highlights the risk of relying on witness testimony based on potentially unreliable recollections and the importance of corroborating evidence like purchase orders or contracts. The destruction of records, though explained, negatively impacted the taxpayer's ability to prove its case and emphasized the need for contemporaneous documentation. Later cases citing *Rossum Brothers* emphasize the need for taxpayers to provide concrete evidence of a definite plan to change the business character.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.