L.A. Thompson Stone Co. v. Commissioner, 19 T.C. 210 (1952)

When determining excess profits tax credits under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, the court is not required to accept the taxpayer's precise reconstruction of income or the Commissioner's, but may determine a fair and just amount of normal earnings based on credible evidence and the exercise of reasonable judgment.

Summary

The L.A. Thompson Stone Co. sought relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, claiming that a severe drought during the base period of its excess profits tax calculation depressed its earnings. The Tax Court found that the drought constituted a qualifying factor, but disagreed with the taxpayer's specific method of reconstructing income. The court held that it was not bound to accept either the taxpayer's or the Commissioner's proposed figures and instead determined a constructive average base period net income based on credible evidence and its own judgment, considering sales figures and profit ratios. The case underscores the court's flexibility in evaluating claims of economic hardship under the excess profits tax regulations and its ability to determine a fair tax liability even in the absence of precise calculations.

Facts

L.A. Thompson Stone Co. experienced a severe drought throughout its trade area during the base period used to calculate its excess profits tax. The drought, and to a lesser extent, insect infestation, significantly curtailed farm income, which in turn reduced the purchasing power of the company's customers, and thus depressed the company's earnings. The company sought a reconstruction of its base period earnings to reflect normal levels, arguing the drought was a "qualifying factor" under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code. The company submitted calculations to support its claim. The Commissioner disputed the extent of the drought's impact and proposed alternative figures. Both parties agreed that reconstructing a reasonable sales figure for the base period and applying a profit ratio was the soundest approach, but they disagreed on the specifics of the reconstruction.

Procedural History

The case was heard before the United States Tax Court. The company filed a petition contesting the Commissioner's determination of its excess profits tax credit. The Tax Court, after reviewing the evidence and arguments presented by both sides, issued an opinion and determined the constructive average base period net income. A decision was entered under Rule 50.

Issue(s)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Whether the drought and insect infestation adversely affected the taxpayer's base period earnings to such an extent that the average of such earnings is an inadequate standard of normal earnings under section 722.

2. Whether the taxpayer met its burden of proving the extent to which its base period earnings were affected by the drought.

3. If the taxpayer met its burden, what is the proper method, or what specific figures, should be used to reconstruct a fair and just amount of normal earnings for the base period, and what is the appropriate constructive average base period net income?

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found that the drought and insect infestation adversely affected the taxpayer's base period earnings.

2. Yes, because the court held that it was sufficient for the taxpayer to introduce acceptable proof upon which the court could determine normal earnings within a reasonable range. The court did not require exactitude.

3. The court determined its own constructive average base period net income based on the evidence and a reasonable exercise of judgment, rejecting both the taxpayer's and the Commissioner's proposed figures.

Court's Reasoning

The court first established that the drought was a "qualifying factor" affecting the taxpayer's earnings. The court addressed the Commissioner's argument that the taxpayer failed to meet the burden of proof. The court clarified that exactitude in determining a fair amount of normal earnings was not required. "It is sufficient for minimal requirements if petitioner has introduced into the record acceptable proof on the basis of which we are able to determine normal earnings in an amount which is fair and just within the limits of a reasonable range of the exercise of judgment." The court emphasized that it could determine a reconstruction based on the facts in the record, independently of those proposed by either party. The court considered calculations, analyses, and charts from both parties, finding none as determinative, but useful. The court reconstructed sales figures and applied an appropriate profit ratio. The court used prior years' financial data and made adjustments based on its judgment.

Practical Implications

This case offers guidance in several ways for tax attorneys and accountants:

- It demonstrates that in cases involving excess profits tax claims under Section 722, the court may exercise broad discretion in determining constructive

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

average base period net income, so long as that determination is supported by credible evidence.
- It clarifies the burden of proof for taxpayers claiming relief under Section 722. Taxpayers do not need to present a perfect reconstruction of earnings, but rather sufficient evidence for the court to make a reasonable determination.
- The case highlights the importance of presenting detailed financial data and analyses to support the claim of economic hardship.
- The case serves as a reminder that the court may reject the calculations of both the taxpayer and the Commissioner, and formulate its own determination.

Later cases may cite this case when analyzing the burden of proof required to demonstrate that a qualifying factor significantly impacted a taxpayer's earnings. This ruling may influence the settlement strategy in similar tax disputes, as it indicates that the court may reach a compromise result.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.