City Machine & Tool Co. v. Commissioner, 16 T.C. 956 (1951)

A taxpayer is not estopped from correcting an error in a prior tax return, even if the position taken is inconsistent, provided the error was based on a mistake of law and the government was not prejudiced.

Summary

City Machine & Tool Co., a subsidiary, erroneously treated its income during the base period years as rental income paid to its parent company. The IRS accepted this treatment. Later, City Machine sought to recompute its excess profits credit, claiming it should have paid taxes on the income directly, relying on the *National Carbide Corp. v. Commissioner* decision. The IRS argued City Machine was estopped from changing its position. The Tax Court held that City Machine was not estopped because the original error was a mistake of law, and the IRS was aware of the facts. Further, the court recognized that the tax code specifically allows for adjustments in such inconsistent positions, making estoppel inappropriate. The court ruled in favor of the taxpayer allowing them to correct the prior tax errors.

Facts

- City Machine & Tool Co. (City Machine) was a wholly owned subsidiary of The City Auto Stamping Company (the parent).
- City Machine was inactive prior to October 1936. The parent company operated a die business and leased it to City Machine, which then paid rent equal to its net income to the parent.
- City Machine reported a net loss of $25 annually for franchise tax. The parent company reported the jobbing die business’s net income.
- In 1940, the lease was canceled, and the die enterprise was transferred to City Machine in exchange for stock.
- City Machine computed its excess profits credit based on invested capital.
- City Machine argued that under *National Carbide Corp. v. Commissioner*, the lease should be disregarded, allowing it to compute its excess profits credit based on its income during the base period years.
- The IRS argued that City Machine was estopped from disclaiming the validity of the lease and asserting taxable net income.

Procedural History

- City Machine filed a petition with the Tax Court seeking relief from excess profits tax under section 722.
- City Machine filed a motion to amend its petition to raise a standard issue. The Tax Court denied the motion.
- The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals remanded the proceeding with instructions to grant the motion.
- The Tax Court considered the standard issue of whether City Machine had

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

taxable net income during the base period years.

Issue(s)

1. Whether City Machine had taxable net income during the base period years (1936-1939), enabling it to compute its excess profits credit under section 713(f) of the Code.
2. Whether City Machine was estopped from asserting that it had taxable net income, given its prior treatment of income as rental income to the parent company.

Holding

1. Yes, City Machine had taxable net income in each of the base period years because the lease arrangement should be disregarded for tax purposes under *National Carbide Corp. v. Commissioner*.
2. No, City Machine was not estopped because its initial error was a mistake of law, not fact, and the government knew the facts and was not prejudiced.

Court’s Reasoning

The court first addressed whether the subsidiary had taxable net income. It cited *National Carbide Corp. v. Commissioner*, which held that corporations formed for business purposes must pay taxes on their earned income, even if wholly owned by a parent company. The court found the lease arrangement in this case was analogous to the agency or sales contract in *National Carbide*, and thus disregarded it for tax purposes. The court stated, "We agree with the petitioner that its tax treatment of the income which was earned by it during the base period years was erroneous as a matter of law."

Regarding estoppel, the court found no basis for it. The IRS knew the facts (the lease agreement) from the beginning. The court noted that the original mistake was one of law, the erroneous interpretation of the legal obligations stemming from the lease arrangement, not of fact. The court held, "There was no misrepresentation or concealment of material facts on the part of petitioner, nor was the respondent induced to change his position to his detriment in reliance on any representations by the petitioner."

The court also emphasized that Congress specifically addressed the issue of inconsistent positions. It referenced section 734 of the Internal Revenue Code, which authorizes adjustments when the treatment of an item for excess profits tax purposes is inconsistent with prior treatment for income tax purposes. This legislative intent further supported the court’s decision that estoppel should not apply.

Practical Implications

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

- This case underscores the importance of distinguishing between mistakes of fact and mistakes of law in tax matters.
- Taxpayers are generally not estopped from correcting mistakes of law, especially when the government had knowledge of the facts.
- The case reinforces that form does not control over substance in tax law.
- It highlights that the tax code provides mechanisms for correcting inconsistent tax treatments, which often prevents application of estoppel.
- Tax practitioners should be aware that while consistency in tax reporting is generally good practice, it is not an absolute bar to correcting legal errors.
- This case can be cited in other cases where the IRS attempts to estop a taxpayer based on prior inconsistent tax treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.