Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Company, Petitioner, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 20 T.C. 705 (1953)

To claim a tax refund based on an unused excess profits credit carry-back, a taxpayer must file a timely claim, and incorporating the necessary information by reference to other filings does not always satisfy this requirement.

Summary
Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co. sought a refund for excess profits tax for the fiscal year ended July 31, 1943, based on an unused excess profits credit carry-back from 1945. The Tax Court held that the claim was untimely because it was filed outside the statutory period. The court determined that the carry-back claim was not implicitly included in previous applications for relief under Section 722, even though they were cross-referenced in later filings. The court emphasized the necessity of a clear and timely claim for the specific refund sought, directly addressing the applicability of excess profits credit carry-backs.

Facts
Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co. filed for excess profits tax relief under Section 722 for the years 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945. The company filed timely applications for relief for each year. The petitioner's claim for a 1943 refund based on an unused excess profits credit carry-back from 1945 was filed after the statutory deadline. Although the 1944 application referenced carry-back credits, the 1943 application did not. The IRS allowed a carry-back from 1945 to 1944 but denied the carry-back to 1943 due to the untimely claim.

Procedural History
The case began in the United States Tax Court. The IRS determined deficiencies in income tax and overassessments of excess profits tax. The petitioner's primary issue was its entitlement to a carry-back of the unused excess profits credit for 1945 to reduce its 1943 tax liability. The Tax Court considered whether the petitioner's claim was timely filed to use an unused excess profits credit carry-back from 1945 to 1943. The Tax Court ultimately sided with the Commissioner and found that the claim for the 1943 carry-back was untimely.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the unused excess profits credit carry-back from 1945 to 1943 was required by statute regardless of a specific claim.
2. Whether the petitioner’s claim for the carry-back to 1943, filed after the statutory period for filing an original claim, was timely.</li>

Holding

1. No, because under the Code and the regulations, a specific and timely claim is

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

required.
2. No, because the claim was not filed within the period allowed by the statute.

Court's Reasoning
The court stated that the carry-back must have been claimed by petitioner in its claim for refund and could not be assumed by the Court. The court cited Section 322 of the Internal Revenue Code, which generally required refund claims to be filed within three years of the return or two years of tax payment. The court noted a special limitation for unused excess profits credit carry-backs, which must be filed within a specified period after the end of the taxable year. In this instance, the deadline for claiming the 1945 carry-back was October 15, 1948. The court followed the precedent from Lockhart Creamery to determine that since petitioner's claim for the 1943 refund based on the carry-back was filed after this date, it was untimely. The court found that the incorporation by reference of earlier filings was insufficient and did not constitute a timely claim for the specific 1943 carry-back.

The court stated that, “While admitting that the amended application filed on July 7, 1950, was filed after the expiration of the statutory period for filing an original claim for refund based on the carry-back of the 1945 unused excess profits credit, it is the contention of the petitioner that a claim for such carry-back was in substance within the claim for section 722 relief and refund thereunder, which claim was made within the statutory period.”

Practical Implications
This case underscores the importance of precise and timely filing of tax refund claims. Attorneys must advise clients to: (1) ensure claims explicitly state the basis for the refund, particularly when carry-backs are involved; (2) adhere to strict deadlines as non-compliance can forfeit claims; and (3) not rely solely on incorporation by reference, but provide direct references within the relevant time frame. This decision affects tax planning and the handling of disputes, emphasizing that claims for specific tax benefits cannot be inferred from related filings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 