Anchor Hocking Glass Corp. v. Commissioner, 25 T.C. 1089 (1956)

A taxpayer may be entitled to excess profits tax relief if their base period net income is an inadequate measure of normal earnings due to temporary economic circumstances, changes in business character, or other qualifying factors as defined in the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

Anchor Hocking Glass Corp. sought relief from excess profits taxes, arguing that its base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings. The company claimed depression due to the merger of its primary customer and changes in business character. The Tax Court considered the impact of the merger, the introduction of injection molding, the use of a new automatic molding machine, and a shift in sales methods. The court found the company's business was depressed due to the merger and that certain changes in the nature of the business would have increased income. The court calculated adjustments to the company's average base period net income based on these factors, granting relief under the applicable sections of the Internal Revenue Code.

Facts

Anchor Hocking Glass Corp., a manufacturer of plastic closures, experienced declining sales during its base period (1936-1939). The merger of its primary customer, Anchor, with Hocking Glass Company in December 1937, and the resulting changes in personnel and sales policies negatively impacted its business. Anchor Hocking introduced injection molding, invented and used the Sayre automatic molding machine, and adopted a new commission sales agency during the base period.

Procedural History

The case was brought before the United States Tax Court. The court reviewed the taxpayer's claim for excess profits tax relief based on sections 722 (b) (2) and (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, involving the adequacy of base period net income and changes in business character. The Tax Court's decision is the subject of this case brief.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Anchor Hocking's base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to temporary economic circumstances or other qualifying factors?
2. Whether the company's introduction of injection molding, use of the Sayre machine, and adoption of a new sales method constituted qualifying changes in the character of the business under section 722 (b) (4)?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

Holding

1. Yes, because the merger and related circumstances depressed the company's business during the base period.
2. Yes, because these changes satisfied the requirements of section 722 (b) (4), and would have increased income if implemented earlier.

Court's Reasoning

The court first considered the claim that the Anchor-Hocking merger depressed the business. It found that even though the merger occurred late in the base period, its influence was felt earlier, leading to a decline in sales and changes in key personnel. The court cited the Internal Revenue Bureau's bulletin on section 722, which stated that "The term 'economic' includes any event or circumstance… externally caused with respect to a particular taxpayer, which has repercussions on the… volume of sales…of an individual taxpayer."

Next, the court examined the impact of the introduction of injection molding, the Sayre machine, and the new sales method. The court found that injection molding, which occurred during the base period, would have substantially increased sales had it been implemented earlier. The court determined that "substantial demand did exist during the entire base period, that more demand could have been developed…had products been available." Furthermore, the new Sayre automatic molding machine created cost savings. Additionally, the court determined the new sales method would have produced increased income.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance for businesses seeking relief from excess profits taxes. Attorneys should carefully document and present evidence of factors that negatively impacted a company's earnings during the base period. This includes demonstrating that any events were temporary, unusual, and had a significant economic impact. Furthermore, attorneys should understand that changes in business character, such as the introduction of new technology or sales methods, can justify adjustments. This case underscores the importance of presenting a well-supported argument detailing how these changes would have increased income if implemented earlier. Courts consider a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 