22 T.C. 578 (1954)

The valid exercise of a governmental regulatory power is not considered an "unusual" event for purposes of obtaining relief from excess profits taxes under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, even if that exercise results in economic hardship for a taxpayer.

Summary

United Motor Coach Co. sought relief from excess profits taxes, arguing that orders from the Illinois Commerce Commission, directing a competitor to operate on its routes, constituted an "unusual and peculiar" event that depressed its base period income. The Tax Court, on the Commissioner's motion for judgment on the pleadings, held that the regulatory actions, although impacting the company's revenue, were not unusual because the company operated subject to the Commission's authority. The court reasoned that the valid exercise of regulatory power by a governmental body, even if unprecedented in the context of the regulated company, is not an "unusual" event within the meaning of Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Facts

United Motor Coach Co. (Petitioner), a motor carrier under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Commerce Commission, experienced a loss of revenue during its base period. The loss resulted from the Commission's orders directing the Chicago Railways Company to operate on two routes previously served exclusively by Petitioner. Petitioner claimed this regulatory action, which limited its ability to maintain or expand service, was an "unusual and peculiar" event entitling it to relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, specifically subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2). The Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) disallowed Petitioner's claim.

Procedural History

The case began with Petitioner filing for relief under Section 722. The Commissioner disallowed the claim, leading Petitioner to file a petition with the United States Tax Court. The Respondent filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings, arguing that the facts alleged in the petition did not establish a right to relief. The Tax Court considered the motion, accompanied by briefs from both parties.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the orders of the Illinois Commerce Commission, directing competition on Petitioner's routes, constituted an "unusual and peculiar" event under Section 722(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

2. Whether, assuming the events were "economic," they were also temporary, as required to qualify under Section 722(b)(2).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the exercise of regulatory power by the Illinois Commerce Commission, although impacting Petitioner's business, was not an "unusual and peculiar" event, given that Petitioner was subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.

2. No, because the orders of the Illinois Commerce Commission, which caused the loss of revenue for Petitioner, were not temporary in nature.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court first addressed the meaning of "unusual and peculiar" in the context of Section 722(b)(1). The court acknowledged that regulations did not exclusively limit these events to physical occurrences, such as floods or fires. However, the court then focused on the fact that the Illinois Commerce Commission had authority to regulate Petitioner. The court referenced that, in a prior case, it had indicated that a valid exercise of governmental regulatory power would not be regarded as "unusual." The court emphasized that Petitioner was subject to this regulatory power. It reasoned that where such power exists, any valid exercise of it must be considered usual. The court distinguished the case from circumstances that could be considered temporary, emphasizing the lack of an end date to the regulatory effect on the company. The court noted that the order was not temporary and no extension of service or alteration in the company's business was contemplated or requested by the company. The Court granted the Respondent's motion for judgment on the pleadings.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the narrow interpretation of "unusual and peculiar" events for purposes of excess profits tax relief under Section 722. Attorneys should advise their clients that the valid exercise of a governmental regulatory power is unlikely to qualify as an "unusual" event, even if it significantly harms a business's profitability. Businesses operating under regulatory oversight should understand that regulatory actions, even if they cause economic hardship, may not be grounds for seeking relief. This case emphasizes that to be successful, the "unusual" event must also be "peculiar," meaning that it is unique to that particular taxpayer, and not a consequence of general market conditions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.