J.C. Johnson Motor Co. v. Commissioner, 19 T.C. 756 (1953)

When a taxpayer's average base period net income is an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to a change in the character of the business, the Tax Court must estimate a fair and just constructive average base period net income based on the facts, using judgment and imagination to approximate what earnings would have been.

Summary

The J.C. Johnson Motor Co. sought relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, arguing that its average base period net income did not reflect its normal earnings due to changes in its business capacity. The Tax Court agreed that the taxpayer's acquisition of assets and opening of branch stores represented a change in capacity. The court then had to determine the fair and just constructive average base period net income, a process that involved estimating earnings under assumed conditions. The court rejected both the taxpayer's and the Commissioner's computations, instead arriving at its own figure based on a consideration of all the evidence.

Facts

J.C. Johnson Motor Co. acquired certain assets and the store location of another business. It also opened three branch stores during the base period years. The taxpayer sought relief under the Internal Revenue Code to adjust its average base period net income to account for these changes in the capacity for operation of the business. The Commissioner determined a constructive average base period net income. The taxpayer disagreed with the Commissioner's determination, providing its own computations.

Procedural History

The case was initially before the Tax Court. The taxpayer challenged the Commissioner's determination of its constructive average base period net income. The Tax Court reviewed the facts, the arguments, and the computations of both parties.

Issue(s)

Whether the taxpayer is entitled to a constructive average base period net income greater than that determined by the Commissioner under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

Yes, because the court found that the Commissioner's determination was not a fair and just representation of the taxpayer's constructive average base period net

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

income, the court determined the constructive average base period net income was $71,000, higher than the amount allowed by the Commissioner.

Court’s Reasoning

The court’s reasoning centers on the application of Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, which addresses situations where a taxpayer’s average base period net income does not accurately reflect normal earnings due to a change in the character of the business. The court emphasized that the determination of a constructive average base period net income “calls for a prediction and an estimate of what earnings would have been under assumed conditions, an approximation where an absolute is not available and not expected.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.