Arkwright Mills v. Commissioner, 29 T.C. 664 (1958)

A taxpayer seeking relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code must provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that their reconstructed income, even under favorable assumptions, would result in a constructive average base period net income that justifies relief from excess profits tax.

Summary

Arkwright Mills sought relief from excess profits tax under Section 722(b)(4), arguing that a change in its business character (installation of new machinery) occurring two years prior to its actual implementation would have resulted in a higher earning level during the base period. The Tax Court assumed, for the sake of argument, that Arkwright Mills qualified for relief under this section. However, the court denied relief because Arkwright's reconstructed income calculations were flawed and failed to demonstrate that a constructive average base period net income exceeding the existing calculation under Section 713 would be achieved, even with favorable assumptions regarding increased capacity and efficiency. The court emphasized the lack of convincing evidence supporting the taxpayer's substantial projected increase in production and earnings.

Facts

Arkwright Mills modernized its operations by installing new machinery to increase production capacity for Lastex net. The company argued that if this change had occurred two years earlier, as permitted under the 'push-back rule' of Section 722(b)(4), its earnings during the base period (1936-1939) would have been significantly higher. Arkwright Mills presented a reconstructed income calculation based on an assumed 25% increase in productivity from the new machinery and the application of a national business index (Series C) to project earnings in earlier base period years.

Procedural History

Arkwright Mills petitioned the Tax Court for relief from excess profits tax under Section 722(b)(4) and (b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue likely assessed a deficiency in excess profits tax, leading to Arkwright Mills' petition to the Tax Court to contest this assessment and claim relief.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Arkwright Mills qualified for relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code due to a change in the character of its business.
2. Assuming qualification under Section 722(b)(4), whether Arkwright Mills presented a reasonable reconstruction of its income demonstrating that the tax computed without relief resulted in an excessive and discriminatory tax.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. The court found it unnecessary to decide whether Arkwright Mills definitively qualified under Section 722(b)(4).
2. No. Even assuming Arkwright Mills qualified under Section 722(b)(4), the court held that the taxpayer failed to demonstrate that its reconstructed income justified relief because its calculations were based on unfounded assumptions and did not convincingly show a constructive average base period net income that would warrant relief from excess profits tax.

Court's Reasoning

The court assumed, without deciding, that Arkwright Mills might qualify for relief under Section 722(b)(4) due to the increased capacity from new machines and the potential development of a new product. However, the court rejected Arkwright's reconstructed income calculation for several reasons:

- **Flawed 1936 Reconstruction:** Arkwright treated 1936 as if the increased capacity existed for the entire year, disregarding the 'push-back rule' which would limit the benefit to a portion of the year.
- **Inaccurate Cost of Goods Sold:** The cost of goods sold was calculated for the entire product line, not accounting for the higher cost of Lastex material used in the new product.
- **Inadequate Deductions:** Deductions, such as officer compensation and bad debts, were underestimated or omitted, failing to reflect the likely increased expenses associated with higher business volume.
- **Unfounded Production Increase Assumption:** Arkwright's central flaw was assuming a 25% increase in productivity applied to 1939 income and then projecting this inflated figure back to earlier base period years using a national business index. The court found no evidence to support such a substantial increase, especially since the new machines had been operational for a significant portion of the base period. The court stated, "There is no convincing evidence that if the increase in capacity had occurred 2 years sooner petitioner's level of operations would have expanded not only by the assumed 20 per cent increase in capacity but, in addition, by an increase of 25 per cent over the end of the base period."
- **Lack of Evidence for Efficiency Gains:** While acknowledging potential gains in worker skill over time, the court found no evidence that the machines were not already operating at practical capacity by the end of the base period. The court noted, "We are willing to assume that some increase in the skill, or even in the number, of the "twist hands" operating the machines might have been achieved by 2 years of additional experience but there is no evidence that the machines themselves were not being used as great a proportion of the time as was practical."

The court concluded that even using a more realistic 5% presumptive increase in

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

production due to experience, combined with the Series C index, Arkwright Mills could not demonstrate a constructive average base period net income sufficient to justify relief under Section 713(f). Therefore, Arkwright failed to prove that the tax was “excessive” or “discriminatory”.

Practical Implications

Arkwright Mills underscores the critical importance of robust and well-supported reconstructed income calculations when seeking tax relief under Section 722(b)(4) or similar provisions. Taxpayers must provide concrete evidence and sound methodology to justify their projections of increased earnings. Unsupported assumptions, flawed calculations, and inadequate consideration of expenses will undermine a claim for relief. This case serves as a cautionary example for tax practitioners, highlighting the need for meticulous financial analysis and realistic projections grounded in factual evidence rather than optimistic estimations when arguing for constructive income adjustments in tax relief cases. It emphasizes that even if a taxpayer arguably meets the threshold for potential relief due to a change in business character, the ultimate success hinges on convincingly demonstrating, through detailed and credible financial reconstructions, that the statutory relief mechanism is warranted to avoid an excessive and discriminatory tax burden.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.