The United States Rubber Reclaiming Co., Inc. v. Commissioner, 23 T.C. 139 (1954)

To claim an excess profits tax credit under I.R.C. § 722(c)(3), a taxpayer must prove that its invested capital was abnormally low, and that this abnormal capital structure led to an inadequate standard for determining excess profits.

Summary

The United States Rubber Reclaiming Co., Inc. sought a higher excess profits tax credit, arguing its invested capital was abnormally low, making the standard for determining its excess profits inadequate. The Tax Court found the company failed to demonstrate an abnormally low invested capital because it did not provide sufficient evidence to establish what a normal capital structure for its industry would be, or demonstrate how its capital structure deviated from that norm. Consequently, the court denied the company's claim, emphasizing the taxpayer's burden to provide concrete data to support its claim of an abnormally low invested capital.

Facts

The United States Rubber Reclaiming Co., Inc. (petitioner) was organized after December 31, 1939, and thus required to compute its excess profits tax credits based on invested capital. It sought a higher credit under I.R.C. § 722, arguing the invested capital was abnormally low. The petitioner manufactured gasoline hose, but did not have the same investment capital of its competitors. It attempted to show its invested capital was abnormally low by comparing ratios of borrowed capital, and by comparing capital stock and surplus of its predecessor to its own figures. The petitioner also compared its turnover of capital in sales to that of its predecessor.

Procedural History

The case was brought before the Tax Court of the United States. The court reviewed the petitioner's claims for a higher excess profits tax credit and the evidence submitted to support the claim. The Tax Court found that the petitioner had not met its burden of proof and denied the claim. The Court's decision was reviewed by the Special Division.

Issue(s)

Whether the petitioner's invested capital was abnormally low, rendering the excess profits credit based on invested capital an inadequate standard for determining excess profits, per I.R.C. § 722(c)(3).

Holding

No, because the petitioner failed to provide sufficient evidence to establish that its

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

invested capital was abnormally low, the court denied the petitioner's claim for relief under I.R.C. § 722(c)(3).

Court's Reasoning

The court's decision relied on the interpretation of I.R.C. § 722(c)(3), which states that an excess profits credit is considered excessive if based on invested capital that is an inadequate standard for determining excess profits because the invested capital of the taxpayer is abnormally low. The court cited EPC 35 and Regulations 112, § 35.722-4(c), which describes how an abnormally low invested capital can be established. The court highlighted that the petitioner had not provided any evidence to show what a normal capital structure would be for its industry, so they had failed to establish that their capital was unusually low, and, therefore, abnormal. Specifically, the court stated, "With the case in such a posture as this, i. e., the complete absence of any proof as to what normals might be, it is impossible for us to say that petitioner has met its burden and established that its invested capital was abnormally low in order to come within the provisions of section 722 (c) (3)."

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes the importance of providing sufficient evidence and a proper method of analysis to support claims for tax credits. Taxpayers seeking relief under I.R.C. § 722(c)(3) must not only show their invested capital is low, but also demonstrate that this low capital is abnormal relative to industry standards or other relevant benchmarks. The court's decision underscores the necessity of providing a factual basis. This includes providing evidence of the taxpayer's industry norms or showing some other means to measure what would be considered normal, to allow for a comparison. Failing to do so, as the petitioner did, will likely result in the denial of the claim. Furthermore, the case highlights the significance of meeting the burden of proof in tax disputes, and the need for taxpayers to carefully construct their arguments with supporting data. The court's analysis on the application of the statutory language of I.R.C. § 722(c)(3) also demonstrates the court's strict approach to determining tax credits and requires that taxpayers meet their burden of proof.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.