24 T.C. 1032 (1955)

The court determined a fair and just amount representing normal earnings to be used as the petitioner's constructive average base period net income for excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Summary

The R. J. M. Company (Petitioner) contested the Commissioner of Internal Revenue's (Respondent) determination of its constructive average base period net income (CABPNI) for excess profits tax relief. The petitioner was a hardware and steel wholesaler. The court considered the correct CABPNI, which was important for calculating its excess profits tax. The court ultimately determined that the Commissioner's calculation was inaccurate because it did not adequately reflect the petitioner's potential steel sales had it started that part of its business earlier. The court adjusted the sales figures to account for the delayed start of the steel business and also changed the relevant indexes, finding that the Commissioner's figures undervalued the petitioner's profitability during the relevant base period, which ultimately altered the calculation of the excess profits credit.

Facts

R. J. M. Company was incorporated in California in 1935. It primarily engaged in wholesale hardware and builder's supply business in the Los Angeles area. In 1940, the company added a steel warehousing operation. The company was dissolved in 1943. The company sought relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, claiming its base period net income was not representative due to its late start in the steel business. The IRS allowed some relief but disputed the company's figures for its constructive average base period net income (CABPNI). The primary factual disputes related to the estimated steel sales and net profit margins the company would have achieved had it begun its steel business earlier in the base period, and also which market indexes to use.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in the petitioner's income and excess profits taxes for the years 1941, 1942, and the taxable period January 1 to July 21, 1943. The petitioner sought relief under Section 722, which was partially granted. The dispute went before the U.S. Tax Court, challenging the Commissioner's calculation of the constructive average base period net income. The Tax Court reviewed the evidence to determine the correct CABPNI and whether the Commissioner's calculations provided a fair assessment for tax liability.

Issue(s)

Whether the Commissioner's determination of the petitioner's constructive average base period net income (CABPNI) was correct, specifically regarding:

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. The estimated annual steel sales level the company would have attained if the steel warehouse had started operations earlier.
2. The average net profit margin the company would have earned on steel sales during the base period.
3. The appropriate index to be used for back-casting the petitioner's hardware sales to prior base period years.

Holding

1. No, because the court found the Commissioner's estimate of $250,000 for steel sales to be inadequate, the court found the evidence supported a $600,000 sales figure.

2. No, because the court found the Commissioner's net profit margin estimate was too low; the court determined a 12% net profit margin was appropriate, based on a 28% gross profit margin and considering the company's costs.

3. Yes, the wholesale hardware sales index figures were more appropriate than the index for lumber and construction materials, since they more closely approximated the petitioner's business during the base period.

Court's Reasoning

The court addressed the three disputed factors. Regarding estimated steel sales, the court considered testimony from Rawn, Desmond, and Budd, all with relevant experience. The court found the Commissioner's estimate of $250,000 based on a limited approach to sales was too conservative given the evidence that a $600,000 sales figure was more likely. The court also found the Commissioner's net profit margin calculation, which was too low, to be inconsistent with the evidence. The court determined the appropriate index was the wholesale hardware sales index for backcasting petitioner's hardware sales, as it more accurately reflected the petitioner's business experience during the base period. The court cited the stable steel price and Rawn's anticipation that the steel warehouse expenses would not vary greatly from the hardware warehouse expenses. The court concluded, by using the figures, that it had determined that the petitioner's constructive average base period net income was $36,296 for 1940, $95,278 for 1941, and $110,024 for both 1942 and the period from January 1 to July 21, 1943.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of providing strong evidentiary support when challenging the Commissioner's determination of constructive average base period net income under Section 722. The court's willingness to consider expert testimony and market data underscores the need to present a comprehensive case. The court's methodology shows that the court is willing to consider the specific facts of a business, including its growth, and the economic circumstances during the base

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

period. This case reinforces that the burden is on the taxpayer to demonstrate that its actual base period income is not representative of its normal earning capacity. In similar cases, businesses should carefully document their plans, investments, and market analyses to support their claims for excess profits tax relief. This case also offers a framework for determining fair net profit margins, considering both gross profit and operating expenses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.