The Mead Corporation v. Commissioner, 28 T.C. 303 (1957)

A taxpayer seeking excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must not only demonstrate that its base period net income is an inadequate measure of normal earnings due to changes in the business but also establish a specific constructive average base period net income that results in a lower tax liability.

Summary

The Mead Corporation sought relief from excess profits taxes under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, arguing that its base period net income did not reflect its normal earnings due to changes in the character of its business, specifically, an expansion of its plant. The Tax Court acknowledged the plant expansion as a change in the business's capacity. However, it denied relief because the corporation failed to establish a specific, fair, and just amount for its constructive average base period net income. The court emphasized that, to obtain relief under Section 722, the taxpayer must prove that the constructive income would result in lower tax liability than the methods used by the Commissioner.

Facts

The Mead Corporation experienced plant expansion during the base period for excess profits tax calculations. The corporation claimed that this plant expansion constituted a change in the character of its business, making its average base period net income an inadequate measure of normal earnings. The corporation filed applications for relief and claims for refund. However, the corporation did not provide sufficient evidence to establish a specific constructive average base period net income that would have resulted in lower excess profits tax liability.

Procedural History

The Mead Corporation sought relief from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The Commissioner denied the relief. The Mead Corporation then brought the matter before the Tax Court. The Tax Court reviewed the case and issued a decision in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Mead Corporation experienced a change in the character of its business, specifically, an expansion of its plant, during the base period, as defined by Section 722(b)(4)?

2. Whether the Mead Corporation established a specific constructive average base period net income that would produce excess profits credits for the relevant years greater than the credits computed by the invested capital method and actually used by the Commissioner?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the construction of a new and larger building and the installation of additional machinery, increasing its capacity for production, constituted a change in the character of its business under Section 722(b)(4).

2. No, because the Mead Corporation failed to establish a fair and just amount for its constructive average base period net income that would result in lower excess profits tax liability than the credits computed under the invested capital method.

Court's Reasoning

The court determined that the enlargement of the plant constituted a change in the taxpayer's capacity for production or operation. However, the court emphasized that the taxpayer must not only demonstrate that it meets the requirements of Section 722(b)(4) by showing its average base period net income is an inadequate standard of normal earnings but also establish a constructive average base period net income that would produce a lower tax liability than the credits computed under other methods. The Court cited previous cases and stated, "Even so, however, petitioner, to be entitled to relief under section 722, must show not only that its average base period net income is an inadequate standard of normal earnings, but must establish what would be a fair and just amount representing normal earnings, and there is still no relief under section 722 unless the excess profits credit, based upon the constructive average base period net income which is established, is greater than the excess profits credit computed without the benefit of section 722." Because the Mead Corporation failed to provide specific calculations demonstrating lower tax liability using a constructive income amount, the Court rejected the corporation's claim.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of presenting specific, quantifiable evidence when seeking relief under Section 722 or similar tax provisions. It highlights that merely demonstrating a change in the character of a business is insufficient. Taxpayers must clearly establish the financial impact of the change by providing supporting computations for constructive average base period net income, and the resulting tax consequences, to obtain relief. Tax advisors should ensure that all necessary calculations and documentation are prepared and presented in the most favorable light possible. Failure to do so will likely lead to a denial of relief, even if a qualifying event occurred that should have reduced tax liability.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.