George Moser Leather Company, Petitioner, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 31 T.C. 830 (1959)

To qualify for relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, a taxpayer must demonstrate that its base period net income was an inadequate representation of normal earnings due to specific, unusual events or circumstances.

Summary
George Moser Leather Company sought relief from excess profits taxes under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, claiming its earnings were negatively impacted by the 1937 Ohio River flood and the 1934 drought. The Tax Court denied relief, finding the company failed to establish that its base period net income was an inadequate measure of normal earnings. The Court determined that the flood, while unusual, did not result in a lower excess profits tax liability compared to the invested capital method. The Court also found the company did not successfully link the drought's impact to its base period earnings, as hide prices and profit margins were not consistently depressed during this period. The court's decision emphasized the necessity of a direct causal relationship between the unusual event and the taxpayer's diminished earnings during the base period to qualify for relief under Section 722.

Facts
George Moser Leather Company, an Indiana-based leather tanner, sought relief from excess profits taxes for fiscal years ending June 30, 1942-1946. The company's base period, 1937-1940, included two events cited as disruptive: the 1937 Ohio River flood, which inundated the tannery, and the 1934 drought, which reduced the cattle supply and affected the tanning industry. The company claimed the flood disrupted its normal operations and that the drought negatively impacted its industry. The company's excess profits tax returns were filed on an accrual basis. The court provided a detailed record of the company's and the industry's financials to demonstrate the validity of its arguments. The company also provided comparative data from competitor tanning companies.

Procedural History
The George Moser Leather Company filed applications for excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the applications. The company then petitioned the United States Tax Court, seeking a refund for excess profits taxes paid for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942 through 1946. The Tax Court reviewed the case and considered the claims and the evidence, focusing on whether the company met the criteria for relief under Section 722. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, and decision will be entered for the respondent.

Issue(s)
1. Whether the petitioner's average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings because normal production, output, or operation was

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

interrupted or diminished because of the Ohio River flood of January 1937?

2. Whether the petitioner's business or the leather industry's business was depressed during the base period because of the 1934 drought?

Holding
1. No, because the company failed to establish that its average base period net income was an inadequate standard of normal earnings because its excess profits tax liability was not affected by the flood. The credit computed on the average base period net income, as reconstructed for the flood, did not exceed the credit available under the invested capital method.
2. No, because the company failed to show a causal relationship between the 1934 drought, and the impact on its earnings during the base period.

Court's Reasoning
The Court applied Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code to evaluate the company's claims for relief. Under section 722(b)(1), the Court considered whether the Ohio River flood disrupted normal production. The Court found that even accounting for the flood, the income credit method did not yield a lower tax liability than the invested capital method, thus failing to meet the standard for relief. Under section 722(b)(2), the Court assessed whether the drought depressed the company's business. The Court scrutinized evidence of hide prices and profit margins, and determined no clear causal relationship existed between the drought and depressed earnings during the base period. Notably, the court referenced Avey Drilling Machine Co., 16 T.C. 1281 (1951) to support its holding. The Court emphasized that the company needed to demonstrate that the event directly impacted its earnings in the base period.

Practical Implications
This case highlights the stringent requirements for obtaining relief under Section 722. For attorneys, it means focusing on the direct impact of the claimed event on the company's base period earnings. The analysis requires evidence of a direct causal relationship between the unusual event (flood, drought, etc.) and the reduction of the company's earnings during the base period. Financial data must directly link the event to specific losses or decreased profitability. Legal practice should be mindful that proving the existence of the event is insufficient; showing a measurable, direct impact on earnings is essential. This case informs how similar cases should be evaluated, by requiring both an unusual event and direct impact on earnings during the base period.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 