The Wheeler Corporation v. Commissioner, 21 T.C. 852 (1954)

The Tax Court has jurisdiction over amended claims for a refund of excess profits taxes that are based on adjustments under section 711(b)(1)(J) of the Internal Revenue Code, even if the amended claim was filed after the original claim was rejected, provided the second claim is considered an amendment of the first, raising no new issues.

Summary

The Wheeler Corporation filed claims for refunds related to excess profits taxes for 1943 and 1944, based on accelerated amortization of facilities used during World War II. The Commissioner initially disallowed these claims. Wheeler filed amended claims for the same years, reiterating the same arguments and adjustments. The Commissioner rejected the amended claims. The Tax Court addressed the issue of its jurisdiction, ruling that it had jurisdiction because the second claim was an amendment of the original claim, specifically concerning adjustments under section 711(b)(1)(J). The Court held that it had jurisdiction over the merits because a notice of rejection of the original claims had not been provided to the taxpayer.

Facts

The Wheeler Corporation filed claims for refund for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944 related to excess profits taxes, with an adjustment due to accelerated amortization. These initial claims were based upon a recomputation of its accelerated amortization pursuant to the subsequent Presidential proclamation issued following the conclusion of World War II. The Commissioner did not act favorably on these claims and later rejected them. The corporation then filed amended claims for the same years, again citing the same reasons for the refund. The Commissioner rejected these amended claims and later assessed a deficiency for 1946. The corporation petitioned the Tax Court, challenging the disallowance of the claims and the deficiency.

Procedural History

The Commissioner initially moved to dismiss the case for 1943 and 1944 because no deficiency had been determined. The Tax Court granted this motion. The corporation filed amended claims for the same years, and the Commissioner rejected these claims and subsequently issued a notice of deficiency for the fiscal year 1946. The corporation filed a petition in the Tax Court challenging the disallowance of the claims. The cases were consolidated. The court considered whether it had jurisdiction, especially in relation to the 1943 claim, which was initially dismissed.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Tax Court had jurisdiction to determine the correctness of the 711 adjustments regarding the 1943 claim despite the prior dismissal and the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Commissioner’s rejection of the claim?

2. Whether interest paid on notes issued as dividends was an allowable deduction under section 711(b)(1)(K)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the amended claim for 1943 was an amendment of the original, and therefore, the Tax Court had jurisdiction, since the notice of rejection of the original claims had not been provided to the taxpayer.

2. Yes, the interest paid on notes issued as dividends was deductible because the corporation’s actions were motivated by a desire to obtain a dividends-paid credit under the undistributed profits tax of 1936, not by a change in the taxpayer’s operation.

Court’s Reasoning

The court determined that the second claim, filed after the initial rejection, was an amendment of the first and raised no new issues. The rejection of the original claim did not prevent the Tax Court from considering the amended claim. The court pointed out that the original claim was still pending, at least to the extent of the amount of the 711(b)(1)(J) adjustment, and the Tax Court has exclusive jurisdiction over actions involving abnormalities under Section 711. Moreover, section 124(d)(5) prohibits offsetting a section 711 disallowance against a section 124 refund.

Regarding the second issue, the court found that the interest payments were not disallowed under section 711(b)(1)(K)(ii). This section disallowed deductions that resulted from an increase in income or a change in the taxpayer’s operations. The court found that the issuance of dividend notes was driven by a desire to claim a dividend-paid credit, rather than a change in operations. “We think it would be unreasonable to conclude that the manifest desire to save taxes and distribute its earnings in a taxable form was the consequence in anything but a remote degree, if at all, of a change in the operation of the business.”

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the interplay between amended claims for refunds and the jurisdiction of the Tax Court, specifically regarding excess profits taxes and Section 711 adjustments. It highlights the importance of characterizing a subsequent filing as an amendment, rather than a wholly new claim, for jurisdictional purposes. The holding provides guidance on what constitutes a change in the operation of the business and its relationship to deductible interest payments. If a taxpayer is filing for refunds under section 711, it is important to ensure that the filings are considered amendments of a previous filing, and not a new claim, in order to ensure the Tax Court has jurisdiction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

This case also illustrates the court’s analysis of the intent of the taxpayer, and the business circumstances, when deciding on a tax matter.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.