25 T.C. 1325 (1956)

The Tax Court denied excess profits tax relief, holding that the evidence did not support a reconstruction of base period earnings that would result in greater credits than those available under the invested capital method.

Summary

Megowen-Educator Food Company (petitioner) sought excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code for the years 1943, 1944, and 1945. The petitioner, a new corporation formed in 1937 after a bankruptcy reorganization of its predecessors, argued that its base period earnings were depressed due to an automobile accident, subsequent bankruptcy, and loss of customers. The Tax Court, however, found that the evidence did not support a reconstruction of base period earnings that would generate larger credits than those already available under the invested capital method. The court noted that the petitioner could not claim relief under 722(b)(2) because the circumstances cited as causing the depression occurred before the company's existence.

Facts

Petitioner was incorporated in 1937 in Massachusetts, taking over the business of manufacturing and selling biscuits and crackers from two related corporations. In 1936, one of the predecessor companies' trucks was involved in an accident resulting in significant injury claims, leading to the company filing for bankruptcy. A reorganization created the petitioner company. The petitioner sought excess profits tax relief for 1943, 1944, and 1945, claiming depressed base period earnings due to the accident, bankruptcy, and loss of customers. The company's income fluctuated greatly during the base period and subsequent years, with the downturn largely due to the introduction of similar products by competitors. Petitioner's base period earnings were, however, not depressed due to factors relevant to section 722.

Procedural History

The case was heard by the United States Tax Court. The petitioner claimed excess profits tax relief under section 722(b)(2), (b)(4), and (b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The Tax Court agreed that the petitioner was entitled to a reconstruction of base period income because it was formed during the base period. The court also stated that there was no basis for a reconstruction that would result in greater relief than was afforded by the invested capital method.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioner's base period income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to the automobile accident, bankruptcy, and loss of customers?

2. Whether the evidence supported a reconstruction of the petitioner's base period

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

earnings that would result in greater credits than those available under the invested capital method?

Holding

1. No, because the court found that the circumstances causing the depressed income occurred before the corporation's existence and did not constitute a basis for excess profits relief under section 722(b)(2).

2. No, because the court found that even if it considered the predecessor's earnings, the evidence did not show that at the end of the base period petitioner's earnings would have reached such a point that any reconstruction would provide a greater excess profits credit.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the petitioner's claims for excess profits tax relief under section 722. The court determined that the petitioner qualified for relief under subsection (b)(4) as a corporation formed during the base period, agreeing with the respondent. The court rejected the claim under (b)(2) because the accident and bankruptcy, which the petitioner cited as the cause of the depression, occurred prior to the petitioner's existence. Further, the court examined the petitioner's predecessors' earnings history to support a reconstruction of base period earnings, but the evidence showed sporadic earnings and no guarantee of a greater tax credit than the invested capital method provided. The court stated, "In no event would the evidence of record support a reconstruction of base period earnings that would yield credits as great as those already available to petitioner under the invested capital method."

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.