Green Bay Box Co. v. Commissioner, 27 T.C. 69 (1956)

A taxpayer cannot raise new grounds for relief in Tax Court that were not presented to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue during the administrative review of their claim.

Summary

Green Bay Box Co. sought excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, arguing its business was depressed during the base period (1936-1939). Initially, it claimed a "price war" caused the depression. Before the Tax Court, however, it argued the depression stemmed from overexpansion in the kraft pulp industry. The Tax Court refused to consider this new argument, holding that the taxpayer could not raise new grounds for relief not previously presented to the Commissioner. This case highlights the importance of exhausting administrative remedies and properly framing issues in initial filings.

Facts

Green Bay Box Co. manufactured paper board containers, using both jute liner board (waste paper and kraft pulp) and chip board (waste paper). It claimed its business was depressed during the base period (1936-1939), impacting its excess profits tax liability. In its initial application for relief, the company attributed the depression to a "price war" within the industry.</r

Procedural History

Green Bay Box Co. filed applications for relief with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Commissioner denied the applications, finding the company had not established its right to relief. The company then petitioned the Tax Court, shifting its argument to claim the depression was due to overexpansion in the kraft pulp industry. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's decision, refusing to consider the new argument.

Issue(s)

Whether the Tax Court may consider grounds for relief under Section 722(b)(2) that were not presented to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue during the administrative review process.

Holding

No, because taxpayers must present their grounds for relief and supporting facts to the Commissioner for consideration before seeking judicial review. Regulations prevent new grounds presented after the filing deadline from being considered.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Tax Court emphasized that it will not consider arguments or supporting facts unless they were first presented to the Commissioner. The court cited Tax Court Rule 63, requiring that applications for refund or relief be attached to the petition to ensure the grounds relied upon before the Court were presented to the Commissioner. The court noted that the company's initial application attributed the depression to a "price war," not overexpansion in the kraft pulp industry. The court stated, "This Court has clearly indicated in its prior decisions that it will not consider grounds for relief or supporting facts unless they have been presented to the Commissioner for his consideration prior to his rejection of the applications and claims." The court also cited Regulations 112, section 35.722-5(a), which states, "No new grounds presented by the taxpayer after the date prescribed by law for filing its application will be considered in determining eligibility for relief…" Since the company failed to raise the overexpansion argument before the Commissioner, the Tax Court refused to consider it.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle of exhausting administrative remedies. Taxpayers seeking refunds or relief must clearly and completely present all grounds and supporting facts to the IRS during the administrative phase. Failure to do so can preclude those arguments from being considered by the Tax Court. This case underscores the importance of thorough preparation and strategic decision-making in the initial filings with the IRS. It serves as a reminder that the Tax Court's review is generally limited to the record established before the Commissioner. Litigants should carefully document all information provided to the IRS to ensure a complete record for potential judicial review. Later cases citing Green Bay Box emphasize its rule against considering new arguments not raised during the administrative process.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.