23 T.C. 19 (1954)

To qualify for excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, a taxpayer must demonstrate that their base period income was an inadequate measure of normal earnings due to specific, qualifying circumstances, not just general business conditions.

Summary

The Constitution Publishing Company sought relief from excess profits taxes under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, claiming its base period income was depressed due to intense competition from other Atlanta newspapers. The Tax Court denied relief, finding the competition, while present, wasn't a temporary or unusual circumstance as required by the statute. The court found that Constitution Publishing's earnings were not depressed and that the elimination of a competitor in 1939, while increasing the company's profits, was not the type of change contemplated by the statute for relief. The Court reasoned that the taxpayer must demonstrate that its base period income was depressed because of specific qualifying circumstances, not just general business conditions, and that relief would be granted only if certain conditions were met.

Facts

Constitution Publishing Company published the Atlanta Constitution newspaper. From 1936 to 1939 (the base period), intense competition existed among three Atlanta newspapers: the Constitution, the Atlanta Journal, and the Atlanta Georgian. The Georgian ceased publication in December 1939, after being purchased by James M. Cox, who also acquired the Atlanta Journal. Constitution Publishing sought excess profits tax relief for 1940, 1942, and 1943, arguing that its base period earnings were depressed by the competition. The company contended that the elimination of the Georgian in 1939 led to a significant increase in its earnings, entitling it to relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

The Constitution Publishing Company applied to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for relief from its excess profits taxes. The Commissioner rejected the application and denied the relief sought. The case was then brought before the United States Tax Court for review of the Commissioner's decision.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioner's business was depressed during the base period because of temporary economic circumstances, as required by Section 722(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code?

2. Whether the petitioner experienced a substantial change in the character of its

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

business during the base period entitling it to relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code?

3. Whether the discontinuance of the Georgian was a factor affecting the petitioner's business which resulted in increased earnings, entitling it to relief under Section 722(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the evidence did not show the business was depressed during the base period, and the competition was not temporary or unusual.

2. No, because the petitioner did not experience a substantial change in the character of its business within the meaning of the statute.

3. No, because the increased earnings resulting from the elimination of competition did not qualify the company for relief under this section.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the requirements for relief under Section 722. It emphasized that the statute provided relief only if specific conditions existed and was not based on broad equitable principles. Regarding Section 722(b)(2), the court found that the Constitution Publishing Company's business was not depressed during the base period. The court found that the company's advertising revenue and income from circulation were growing year-by-year, indicating that it was not depressed. Even if the business had been depressed, the court found that the competition from the Georgian was not a temporary economic circumstance unusual in the petitioner's case. The court stated, "Competition is present in almost any business. Instead of it being something unusual, it is quite common." Under Section 722(b)(4), the court found no substantial change in the character of the business. The court held that the increased profits resulted from the elimination of the Georgian's competition, not a change in the nature of Constitution Publishing's business. The court noted that Section 722(b)(5) does not apply because of the lack of qualifying circumstances. The Court emphasized the importance of complying with the specific requirements of Section 722.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the stringent requirements for obtaining relief under Section 722. It demonstrates that general economic conditions or even intense competition, common in many industries, are generally insufficient for relief. Legal professionals should carefully evaluate whether a taxpayer's situation meets all the specific criteria outlined in Section 722 and must provide evidence that shows that the taxpayer's case is unusual. The case illustrates the need to distinguish between factors that affect profitability generally and those that qualify for relief under the statute. The case also shows the importance of documenting the specific

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

circumstances of a business during the base period and how these circumstances affected its earnings. Later cases citing this ruling have reinforced the narrow construction of Section 722 and similar tax relief provisions, stressing the importance of demonstrating a direct link between specific qualifying circumstances and the depression of base period income. Practitioners should advise clients to focus on concrete evidence of unusual or temporary events.

Meta Description

The case clarifies the strict requirements for excess profits tax relief, emphasizing that generalized competition isn’t enough; specific, unusual circumstances must cause base period income depression to qualify.

Tags

Constitution Publishing Co., U.S. Tax Court, 1954, Excess Profits Tax, Section 722, Base Period Income, Competition

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.