Gillette Auto Supply, Inc., 29 T.C. 766 (1958)

To qualify for excess profits tax relief, a taxpayer must demonstrate that it meets specific requirements, including showing its business was depressed in the base period and that its industry experienced conditions that justify relief; defining the relevant "industry" is crucial to this determination.

Summary

Gillette Auto Supply, Inc. sought relief from excess profits tax, arguing that its base period earnings were depressed under several provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court, however, determined that Gillette did not qualify for relief. The court focused on the proper definition of the taxpayer's industry, concluding that Gillette was a wholesaler of plumbing and heating equipment, not a part of the broader construction industry as the taxpayer argued. The court found that Gillette's business was not depressed during the base period and that it did not meet the requirements for relief under any of the cited Code sections. The court emphasized the importance of industry definition in applying the tax relief provisions.

Facts

Gillette Auto Supply, Inc. sought relief from excess profits tax under several provisions of the Internal Revenue Code related to depressed business conditions during the base period. The taxpayer contended its business was depressed because the construction industry (or an industry closely tied to it) was depressed during the base period. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued that Gillette was part of a different industry (wholesale distributors of plumbing and heating supplies) that was not depressed during the same period. The taxpayer presented economic data related to the construction industry nationwide to support its claim, while the Commissioner presented data about the wholesale distribution industry. Gillette's sales area was restricted to Montana, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and portions of Wyoming, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

Procedural History

The case was heard by the Tax Court. The court reviewed the evidence, including economic data and expert testimony, and ultimately ruled against the taxpayer. The court's decision was based on a determination that Gillette did not meet the requirements for excess profits tax relief under the relevant code sections.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayer's business was depressed during the base period because an industry of which it was a member was depressed by reason of temporary economic events unusual in the case of such industry.

2. Whether the taxpayer's business was depressed in the base period by reason of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

conditions generally prevailing in an industry of which the taxpayer was a member, subjecting such taxpayer to a profits cycle differing materially in length and amplitude from the general business cycle.

3. Whether the taxpayer's business was depressed in the base period by reason of conditions generally prevailing in an industry of which the taxpayer was a member, subjecting such taxpayer to sporadic and intermittent periods of high production and profits which periods were inadequately represented in the base period.

Holding

1. No, because the taxpayer failed to establish that it was a member of a depressed industry, since the court found the relevant industry to be wholesale distribution of plumbing and heating supplies and equipment.

2. No, because the taxpayer's profits cycle did not materially vary in length and amplitude from the general business cycle.

3. No, because the taxpayer's earnings experience could be segregated into cyclical patterns, and therefore did not meet the criteria for sporadic periods of high production and profits.

Court's Reasoning

The court's reasoning focused on the definition of "industry" and whether the taxpayer's business was depressed. The court considered the definition of "industry" from the Bulletin on Section 722 and Regulations 109. It concluded that the taxpayer was a member of the wholesale distribution industry of plumbing and heating supplies and equipment, and not the broader construction industry. "In most general terms an 'Industry' comprises a group of business concerns sufficiently homogeneous in nature of production or operation, type of product or service furnished, and type of customers, so as to be subject to roughly the same external economic circumstances affecting tlieir prices, volume and profits." The court found no evidence that the wholesale industry, as defined by the court, was depressed during the base period. The court cited the taxpayer's failure to prove a material variance in the length and amplitude of its profit cycles, comparing them with the overall business cycle. Therefore, the court denied relief under 722(b)(3)(A). The court noted that the taxpayer's earnings experience could be segregated into the same profits cycles as the profits of all corporations in the United States and the profits of all corporations in taxpayer's sales area, so it did not meet the criteria under 722(b)(3)(B).

Practical Implications

This case underscores the critical importance of defining the relevant "industry" when seeking tax relief under provisions like Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code. Attorneys should carefully analyze the nature of their client's business and the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

scope of its market to accurately determine its industry membership. A broad, unsubstantiated claim of industry membership (such as inclusion in the "construction industry") will be insufficient. The court's scrutiny of economic data and the requirement to establish a connection between industry conditions and the taxpayer's specific business performance highlights the need for strong, relevant evidence. The case also illustrates how courts may interpret statutory language and regulations to define and apply economic concepts. Later cases involving the interpretation of tax relief provisions for excess profits could be affected by this decision.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.