Corn Products Refining Co. v. Commissioner, 350 U.S. 46 (1955)

The Supreme Court established the 'hedging exception,' holding that gains and losses from commodity transactions that are an integral part of a taxpayer's business operations to protect against price fluctuations are considered ordinary income or loss, not capital gains or losses.

Summary

Corn Products, a manufacturer of corn starch, bought corn futures contracts to stabilize its raw material costs. When the company realized gains from these futures transactions, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued that these gains should be taxed as capital gains. The Supreme Court held that the futures contracts were an integral part of the company's business and were used to manage the risk of price fluctuations. The Court reasoned that these transactions were not investments in the same way as purchasing stocks or bonds and therefore the gains should be treated as ordinary income, consistent with the company's core business. This case established what became known as the "Corn Products doctrine" or the "hedging exception" to the general rule that gains and losses from the sale of capital assets are treated as capital gains and losses.

Facts

Corn Products Refining Company, a manufacturer of corn starch and other products, purchased corn futures contracts. The company purchased these contracts not for speculation, but to protect itself against increases in the price of corn, its primary raw material. During the years in question, the company sold some of these futures contracts at a profit. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies, claiming the profits from these futures transactions were capital gains. The company argued that these gains were from transactions that were an integral part of its business and should be treated as ordinary income.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially sided with the Commissioner, treating the gains as capital gains. The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the Tax Court's decision. The Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve a conflict among the circuits regarding the tax treatment of hedging transactions.

Issue(s)

Whether the gains from the sale of corn futures contracts were capital gains or ordinary income.

Holding

No, because the gains from the corn futures contracts were considered an integral

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

part of the taxpayer's business and were used to manage the risk of price fluctuations, they were treated as ordinary income.

Court's Reasoning

The Court, relying on the Internal Revenue Code, reviewed the definition of a "capital asset" and found that an exception could be made. The Court held that since the futures contracts were part of the company's business of manufacturing and selling corn products, they did not fall under the definition of "capital assets." The Court emphasized that these contracts served a business purpose by protecting against price fluctuations and ensuring a stable supply of raw materials. The Court stated, "Congress intended that profits and losses arising from the everyday operation of a business be considered as ordinary income or loss rather than capital gain or loss." The Court also noted that allowing capital gains treatment would enable the company to gain a tax advantage, which Congress did not intend. The Court found that these transactions fell squarely within the company's manufacturing business; they were "integrally related to its manufacturing business," and not investments.

Practical Implications

This case is crucial for businesses that hedge their exposure to market risks. The 'Corn Products doctrine' allows businesses to treat gains and losses from hedging transactions as ordinary income or loss, which is essential for accurate financial reporting and tax planning. Lawyers must advise their clients to clearly document the business purpose of hedging activities to establish that the transactions are an integral part of their business. This case has been applied in subsequent cases involving similar situations to determine the tax treatment of various financial instruments used to manage business risks. However, the scope of the 'Corn Products doctrine' has been narrowed by later legislation and court decisions, particularly in the context of financial instruments.

The court's reasoning, especially the determination of the purpose of the hedging activity, is key in similar cases. The court's focus on the integral role of the transactions in the business provides guidance for future cases. Specifically, the Supreme Court stated, "[t]hey were entered into for the purpose of protecting the company from any increase in the price of corn and to assure a ready supply for manufacturing purposes."

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.