25 T.C. 504 (1955)

A taxpayer may be entitled to relief from excess profits taxes under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 if a significant "change in the character of the business" occurred during or immediately prior to the base period, such that the average base period net income does not reflect normal operations.

Summary

Bardons & Oliver, Inc. sought relief from excess profits taxes under Section 722 of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code, arguing its average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings. The company's key argument centered on a "change in the character of the business" due to the development and production of a new type of ram-type Universal turret lathe, substantially different from its older product line. The Tax Court agreed, finding the company's shift to a new product, combined with revitalized dealership networks, warranted relief. This decision illustrates how a significant product innovation can justify adjustments to tax liabilities during wartime excess profits tax periods.

Facts

Bardons & Oliver, Inc. was incorporated on December 31, 1935, succeeding a long-standing partnership and sole proprietorship manufacturing turret lathes. The company's primary product was initially "plain turret lathes." Starting around 1929, the company began developing a new type of "ram-type Universal turret lathe" with significantly enhanced capabilities. This development involved years of design and engineering. The new lathes offered increased versatility compared to the older models, leading to a new market position. The company also improved its distribution network during the base period. The company sought relief from excess profits taxes for the years 1940, 1941, 1942, 1944, and 1945, claiming that its average base period net income was not representative of its normal earning capacity due to the shift in product lines.

Procedural History

Bardons & Oliver, Inc. filed claims for relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied these claims. The case was then brought before the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court reviewed the case, specifically focusing on whether the taxpayer qualified for relief under section 722(b)(4) due to a change in the character of its business. The Tax Court ultimately granted relief, finding that the introduction of a new product line and changes in the company's distribution system entitled it to a constructive average base period net income adjustment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the incorporation of a long-established business immediately prior to the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

base period constituted a “commencement of business” under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, entitling the taxpayer to relief.

2. Whether the design and development of a new type of turret lathe constituted a “change in the character of the business” under Section 722(b)(4), justifying relief.

3. Whether the changes in the petitioner’s management justified relief under Section 722 (b) (4).

4. Whether a progressive reduction in interest burden during base period resulted in abnormality that may be corrected in a reconstruction under section 722.

Holding

1. No, because the incorporation of an existing business, without any change in ownership or control, did not qualify as a “commencement of business” under Section 722(b)(4).

2. Yes, because the introduction of a new, significantly different product line (ram-type Universal turret lathes) constituted a “change in the character of the business” under Section 722(b)(4).

3. No, because the changes in management did not constitute such as to justify relief under section 722 (b) (4).

4. Yes, because the progressive reduction in interest burden during the base period could be corrected in a reconstruction under section 722.

Court’s Reasoning

The court first addressed the “commencement of business” argument, rejecting the taxpayer’s claim that incorporation constituted commencement under Section 722(b)(4). The court reasoned that since the same individuals controlled the business before and after incorporation, there was no substantive change in the enterprise’s ownership or direction. The court distinguished the case from a situation where new owners or significant new capital had been introduced. Next, the court analyzed whether a “change in the character of the business” had occurred. It found that the design, development, and production of the new ram-type Universal turret lathes, with their significantly enhanced capabilities, represented a substantial change. The Court cited the increased capacity and versatility over the old type of lathes. The court also considered the revitalization of the company’s dealer network in its analysis. The court highlighted the steady growth of the company’s market share during the base period, indicating the new product’s positive impact. The court ultimately concluded that the taxpayer’s average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to these factors and granted relief by determining a constructive average base period net income. The Court also held that changes in the company’s management did not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

justify relief.

Practical Implications

This case offers guidance on how to analyze whether a business has experienced a change in character, which is pivotal in excess profits tax cases. The ruling reinforces that a significant product innovation can justify adjustments to tax liabilities. Lawyers advising clients on excess profits tax relief should meticulously document evidence of changes in a product line, and improvements in the business operations, particularly the impact of changes in the business model. The case also underlines the importance of demonstrating a positive effect on sales, market share, and overall business performance as a result of the change. This case also supports a progressive reduction in interest burden during base periods, and illustrates the importance of considering changes in the financial structure of a company. Later cases in this area would reference this case when considering whether a change in the character of a business has occurred.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.