Harriman Nat'l Bank v. Commissioner, 21 T.C. 1358 (1954)

When a fiscal year spans the effective dates of different tax laws, the excess profits tax credit and unused credit must be computed by proration, reflecting the changes in the law during that period.

Summary

The case concerns the determination of excess profits tax credits for a fiscal year that began in 1943 and ended in 1944, a period that spanned changes to the tax code. The court addressed two key issues: first, whether the excess profits credit for such a fiscal year should be prorated to reflect the changes in the law during that time. The second issue, which will not be included in this case brief, concerns the character of a net loss sustained by the petitioner during its fiscal year 1946 from the sale of certain parcels of real estate. The court held that the credit must be prorated, even though the statute did not explicitly provide for proration of the credit itself. The court reasoned that the proration of tax liability under section 710(a)(6) implicitly required two different excess profits credits, one under the law applicable to each calendar year. The court rejected the taxpayer's argument that the 1943 amendments did not apply to the computation of the excess profits credit for a fiscal year beginning before January 1, 1944.

Facts

The Harriman National Bank had a fiscal year that began on December 1, 1943, and ended on November 30, 1944. During this fiscal year, the Revenue Act of 1943 amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, increasing excess profits taxes. Section 201 of the Revenue Act of 1943 provided that the amendments made by the Act were applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1943. Section 710 (a)(6) of the 1939 Code provided a formula for prorating the tax liability for fiscal years spanning calendar years with different tax laws, but no specific provision was made regarding the determination of the excess profits credit or unused credit for such a fiscal year. The Commissioner computed the bank's excess profits credit by prorating the amounts under section 714 before and after the amendment by section 205 of the Revenue Act of 1943. The bank argued that its excess profits credit should be determined solely under the provisions of section 714, as applicable to the year 1943, prior to the amendment.

Procedural History

The case was heard by the United States Tax Court. The court considered the parties' arguments regarding the interpretation of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Revenue Act of 1943 as they applied to the bank's fiscal year. The Tax Court ultimately sustained the Commissioner's determination, concluding that the excess profits credit must be prorated. This decision was reviewed by the court.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Issue(s)

Whether the petitioner must compute its excess profits credit for the year ending November 30, 1944, on a prorated basis, with the 1943 law applying in proportion to the number of days of the fiscal year falling in 1943 and the 1944 law applying in proportion to the number of days of the fiscal year falling in 1944.

Holding

Yes, the petitioner must compute its excess profits credit for the year ending November 30, 1944, on a prorated basis, with the 1943 law applying in proportion to the number of days of the fiscal year falling in 1943 and the 1944 law applying in proportion to the number of days of the fiscal year falling in 1944, because the provisions of section 710 (a) (6), which require two tentative tax computations for a fiscal year falling within the two calendar years, 1943 and 1944, in substance and effect provide expressly that such a fiscal year shall have not one excess profits credit but two different excess profits credits, one determined under the law applicable to 1943 and another determined under the law applicable to 1944.

Court's Reasoning

The court began by acknowledging the seemingly clear language of section 201 of the Revenue Act of 1943, which stated that the amendments were applicable only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1943. However, the court found that this superficial reading did not reflect the true intent and purpose of the statute. The court emphasized that the excess profits credit prescribed by section 714 had no purpose or significance except as it entered into a computation of tax liability under section 710. The court found that section 710(a)(6), which required two tentative tax computations for a fiscal year spanning the two calendar years, implicitly provided for two separate excess profits credits. "…the provisions of section 710 (a) (6), which require two tentative tax computations for a fiscal year falling within the two calendar years, 1943 and 1944, in substance and effect provide expressly that such a fiscal year shall have not one excess profits credit but two different excess profits credits, one determined under the law applicable to 1943 and another determined under the law applicable to 1944." The court reasoned that, because two different credits were used in computing tax liability, both must also be used in computing the unused credit. The court rejected the bank's argument that the proration provision of section 710 (a)(6) applied only to the tax liability itself and not to the computation of the excess profits credit or unused credit.

The court found that the legislative purpose was to treat fiscal years such as those at issue as if they were governed in part by one statute and in part by another. The court also noted that not allowing proration would create a discriminatory situation favoring fiscal year taxpayers. The court concluded that, although the statute did not explicitly state how to compute the excess profits credit and unused credit, Congress did provide that the amended section 714 should govern the computation of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

unused excess profits credit for such a fiscal year.

Practical Implications

This case provides a key principle in interpreting tax law when a fiscal year spans changes in tax regulations. Specifically, when there are statutory formulas that change during a fiscal year, tax credits and unused credits are not immune from proration, especially if that proration is necessary to give effect to the statutory framework of tax liability. When a specific provision is silent on proration, the court will consider the overall intent and structure of the law to determine whether proration is required. This principle is not limited to excess profits tax and may be applicable to similar situations involving any tax credits or calculations when a fiscal year encompasses legislative changes.

This decision also underscores the importance of understanding the interconnectedness of various tax provisions. The court focused on how the excess profits credit and unused credit related to tax liability and considered the practical implications of its ruling.

Later cases may cite this ruling to support the proration of a credit or deduction when a tax law changes mid-year, especially if there is an implicit connection between the credit/deduction and the tax calculation.

Tax law; Tax credit; Proration; Fiscal year

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.