29 T.C. 799 (1958)

To claim the benefits of an unused excess profits credit carryback under the 1939 Internal Revenue Code, a taxpayer must file a timely claim or an amendment specifically asserting the right to the carryback; the Commissioner's actions do not waive this requirement.

Summary

Dale Distributing Company, Inc. sought a refund of excess profits taxes for fiscal year 1943, claiming an unused excess profits credit carryback from 1944. The company had filed initial applications for relief under Section 722, followed by amended applications. However, neither the original nor amended applications specifically mentioned the 1944 carryback. After the statute of limitations had run, the company filed additional amendments. The Commissioner denied the refund, arguing that the claim was untimely because it failed to specify the 1944 carryback within the statutory period. The Tax Court agreed with the Commissioner, emphasizing that the taxpayer must adhere to specific regulatory requirements to claim a carryback and that the Commissioner had not waived these requirements, nor was the Commissioner estopped from asserting the procedural deficiency.

Facts

Dale Distributing Company, Inc. (petitioner) filed timely tax returns for its fiscal year ending March 31, 1943. The petitioner filed applications for relief under Section 722 of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code, claiming the benefits of unused excess profits credits. The petitioner filed amended applications for relief for the taxable years 1942, 1943, and 1944, with related claims for refund, but these did not specify a carryback from 1944 to 1943. A revenue agent computed the petitioner's tax liability, initially including a carryover credit from 1942 to 1943, which was, in effect, the 1944 carryback. The Post Audit Review Section later concluded that the agent's inclusion of the credit was erroneous. Subsequent revised reports disallowed the carryover. The petitioner then filed further amendments to its claims but after the statute of limitations had expired.

Procedural History

The case began with a deficiency determination by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Tax Court reviewed the case. The Tax Court addressed the issue of whether the petitioner was entitled to an unused excess profits credit adjustment for the taxable year ended March 31, 1943, which included any unused excess profits credit carryback from the taxable year 1944. The Tax Court ruled for the respondent, the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioner is entitled to an unused excess profits credit adjustment to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the taxable year 1943, which includes to any extent an unused excess profits credit carryback from the taxable year 1944, despite not having a timely filed claim that specifically claimed said credit.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioner failed to file a timely claim or amendment specifically claiming the benefit of an unused excess profits credit carryback from 1944 to 1943, as required by the regulations.

Court's Reasoning

The court referenced Section 722(d) of the 1939 Code and the relevant regulations, which required taxpayers to file applications for relief and claim carrybacks within the period prescribed by Section 322. The court held that the petitioner had not filed a timely claim or amendment specifically asserting the right to the carryback from 1944 to 1943. Furthermore, the court found that the Commissioner had not waived the regulatory requirements, nor was the Commissioner estopped from asserting the procedural deficiency.

The court distinguished the *Fendrich* case, relied upon by the petitioner, on the basis that in the present case, the issue was attempted to be raised after the determination of the Section 722 issue. The court cited *Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co.* to reject the argument that the allowance of a carryback arising out of a CABPNI is mandatory by virtue of section 710, pointing out that to uphold the petitioner's argument would ignore the requirements that taxpayers file proper claims. The Court also distinguished *Martin Weiner Corp.*, finding that in that case, unlike the present case, the Commissioner had waived regulatory requirements.

The court also rejected the petitioner's argument that its amendments were valid, holding that the petitioner's attempts to amend its claim were filed after the statute of limitations had expired and that there was no longer a pending claim which could be amended. The Court concluded that because the petitioner had not filed timely claims, the Commissioner's determination should be sustained.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the critical importance of strict adherence to procedural rules in tax law, especially concerning claims for refunds based on carrybacks and carryovers. Attorneys handling similar cases must ensure that claims are filed within the statutory period and comply with all regulatory requirements. Claims must specifically identify the tax years, credits, and the basis for the refund. The case also highlights the high bar for establishing a waiver of regulatory requirements by the IRS; merely discussing the potential for tax benefits with an agent is insufficient. Furthermore, this case illustrates the importance of reviewing all communications with the IRS to ensure that claims are preserved throughout the process. Tax

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

practitioners should be aware that even if an agent initially computes the tax liability in a manner that appears to be favorable to the taxpayer, this does not guarantee that the taxpayer will ultimately receive that benefit. Later cases considering the 1939 code would likely rely on this case to emphasize the need for compliance with tax regulations, and to limit the application of waiver and estoppel in similar situations.

Meta Description

Tax Court case: Taxpayers must file timely, specific claims for unused excess profits credit carrybacks; IRS actions do not waive this requirement.

Tags

Dale Distributing Co., Tax Court, 1958, Excess Profits Tax, Carryback, Claim for Refund, Statute of Limitations

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.