White v. Commissioner, 28 T.C. 234 (1957)

To qualify for relief under the excess profits tax provisions, a taxpayer must demonstrate that its income is abnormal within the meaning of the statute, and that such abnormality warrants an adjustment to its tax liability; mere increases in sales due to favorable economic conditions are generally not considered abnormal.

Summary

The United States Tax Court addressed a transferee liability case involving American Gear and Manufacturing Co. (American), whose assets were transferred to Maurice A. White. The core issues revolved around American's claim for excess profits tax relief. The company sought relief under sections 721 and 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, arguing that its income was abnormal. The court held against White, finding that American's income was not abnormal as defined by the statute and that the company's computation of a constructive average base period net income under section 722(b)(4) was unrealistic and unsupported by evidence. The court emphasized that increased business activity related to the war effort did not constitute abnormal income and was not eligible for relief. Ultimately, the court ruled that White was liable for the assessed transferee liability.

Facts

Maurice A. White operated a sole proprietorship, American Stock Gear Company, starting in 1931. In 1942, he incorporated it as American Gear and Manufacturing Co. American issued stock to White in exchange for the assets and liabilities of the sole proprietorship. Later in 1942, White, the sole stockholder, received all of American's assets in exchange for surrendering his stock and assuming American's liabilities. The company's business involved manufacturing gears, with a significant increase in sales and profits, particularly during World War II. American filed for excess profits tax relief, claiming abnormal income. The IRS disallowed the relief and assessed transferee liability against White. White contested the assessment, also claiming relief under section 721 and section 722(b)(4). The business expanded rapidly during the late 1930s and early 1940s, with increased demand for gears and an expansion of manufacturing capacity to meet wartime contracts.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in American's income and excess profits taxes for the period of April 7, 1942, to December 31, 1942, and issued a notice of transferee liability to White. The case was brought before the United States Tax Court, where White contested the transferee liability and sought relief under sections 721 and 722(b)(4) of the 1939 Code. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, denying White's claims for relief.

Issue(s)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Whether a portion of the deficiency determined by the respondent, undisputed by the parties and due to standard issue adjustments, is barred by the statute of limitations.

2. Whether White is entitled to relief from excess profits tax under section 721 of the 1939 Code.

3. Whether White is entitled to relief from excess profits tax under section 722(b)(4) of the 1939 Code.

Holding

1. No, because the statute of limitations did not bar assessment of the undisputed portion of the deficiency.

2. No, because White failed to establish that his income was abnormal under section 721.

3. No, because White failed to establish a fair and just amount to be used as a constructive average base period net income under section 722(b)(4).

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court first addressed the statute of limitations issue, finding the assessment timely due to the waiver extending the assessment period. Next, the court addressed the claimed relief under Section 721, requiring the taxpayer to establish a class of abnormal income, the amount of net abnormal income, and its attribution to other years. The court found that all of American's income was from manufacturing and selling gears, not a distinct class of income. The court cited regulations stating that income increases due to high prices or increased demand do not qualify as abnormal income. Furthermore, any increase in profits was attributable to improved business conditions brought about by the war. Finally, the Court considered the Section 722(b)(4) claim, which required White to establish what would have been the company's normal earnings. The Court found White's method of calculating a constructive average base period net income completely unrealistic, arbitrary, and based on conditions after the relevant base period. The court noted that White's computation was based on post-1939 conditions, which contradicted Congress's intent to eliminate consideration of the effects of the war.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.