Farmers Creamery Co. of Fredericksburg, Va., 18 T.C. 241 (1952)

To obtain excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, a taxpayer must demonstrate a depressed base period net income and provide a reasonably accurate method for reconstructing earnings to arrive at a larger excess profits tax credit based on income compared to the credit based on invested capital.

Summary

Farmers Creamery Company sought excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, arguing that its business was negatively affected by a drought during its base period. The Tax Court acknowledged the drought's impact on the company's earnings. However, the court determined that even when reconstructing the company's base period net income to account for the drought, the resulting excess profits tax credit based on income would not exceed the credit the company already received based on invested capital. The court emphasized the need for a taxpayer to not only demonstrate a qualifying factor but also to provide a reconstruction method that would result in a larger tax credit.

Facts

Farmers Creamery Co. experienced a loss of $11,869.15 during its average base period net income. For the taxable year 1943, the company used an excess profits tax credit of $15,373.90 based on invested capital. The company sought relief under Section 722 (b) (1) and (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, due to a severe drought in Nebraska during the base period. The drought negatively affected farm income and, consequently, the creamery's earnings. The company's operating expenses were high during the base period. While the court recognized the drought as a qualifying factor, it found that the company's proposed reconstruction of earnings did not result in a larger credit than that available under the invested capital method. The petitioner had suffered losses in years leading up to the base period, and its sales declined in the years leading up to the drought.

Procedural History

The case was heard in the United States Tax Court. The petitioner filed a claim for a refund of excess profits tax paid. The Tax Court considered stipulated evidence from related cases (S. N. Wolbach Sons, Inc., Sartor Jewelry Co., and Schwarz Payer Co.) to establish the existence and effect of the drought. The court ruled in favor of the Respondent, denying the claim for relief under section 722.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the drought in Nebraska qualifies as a factor that depressed the petitioner's earnings during the base period, thus entitling the petitioner to relief under Section 722 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether the petitioner's proposed reconstruction of base period net income, to account for the drought, would result in an excess profits tax credit based on income that exceeds the credit already allowed based on invested capital.

Holding

1. Yes, the drought qualified as a factor depressing the petitioner's earnings.

2. No, because even after reconstructing the base period earnings, the resulting excess profits tax credit based on income would not exceed the credit already allowed under the invested capital method.

Court's Reasoning

The court acknowledged the impact of the drought on the petitioner's earnings, satisfying the requirement under Section 722(b)(2). However, the court emphasized that the petitioner must not only demonstrate a qualifying factor but also demonstrate how their earnings were depressed and provide a reasonably accurate method of reconstructing base period earnings to a credit larger than that based on invested capital. The court assessed the evidence related to the methods of reconstruction. It considered the petitioner's sales figures, operating expenses, and net profit ratios. The court noted that the petitioner experienced net losses in some pre-base period years. Applying a reasonable ratio of net profits to sales, based on actual experience, did not yield a reconstructed average base period net income resulting in a larger excess profits credit based on income. The court concluded that no reasonable reconstruction would yield a larger excess profits tax credit based on income than that allowed under the invested capital method. The court cited prior cases, like Sartor Jewelry Co., and Schwarz Paper Co., in support of the decision.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of providing evidence supporting not only the existence of a qualifying factor (like a drought, war, or disruption) but also demonstrating that reconstructing base period earnings results in a better tax outcome. Tax practitioners should carefully gather and present evidence. They must show how the factor negatively affected the taxpayer's earnings, and they must provide a reasonable reconstruction of the earnings. This case illustrates the need to thoroughly analyze the impact of the qualifying factor. A taxpayer seeking relief under Section 722 must present a compelling case for how the factor diminished the taxpayer's profits, and how the reconstruction of earnings would increase the tax credit. Additionally, this case illustrates the potential limitations to the relief available. Even if a qualifying factor is present, relief may be denied if the taxpayer cannot meet the requirements of showing a reconstruction method that produces a better result. Later cases citing this one continue to emphasize the two-pronged approach: showing a qualifying event and showing that the resulting tax credit is better than the current tax credit. The case reinforces the need to thoroughly

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

analyze financials and present a well-supported reconstruction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.