Fontenelle Hotel Co. v. Commissioner, 18 T.C. 315 (1952)

To qualify for excess profits tax relief, a taxpayer must demonstrate that its average base period net income is an inadequate standard of normal earnings due to specific, qualifying factors, such as a factor that is not directly attributable to general business conditions or the ordinary course of competition.

Summary

The Fontenelle Hotel Co. sought excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code. They argued that a lease contract modification, which reduced rental income, and the competition from a new, modern hotel, caused an inadequate standard of normal earnings during the base period. The Tax Court denied relief, holding that the lease modification and competitive pressures did not qualify as factors warranting relief under the statute. The Court emphasized that competition is a normal aspect of business and that the taxpayer's situation did not meet the criteria for relief under the excess profits tax regulations, specifically distinguishing the case from situations impacted by general economic downturns.

Facts

Fontenelle Hotel Co. owned and operated a hotel. In 1936, the hotel entered into an amended lease agreement that reduced rental income. During the relevant tax years (1942-1945), the hotel faced competition from a new, more modern hotel in the same area. The hotel claimed that the reduced rental income and the competition from the modern hotel caused an inadequate standard of normal earnings during the base period, which entitled it to excess profits tax relief under Section 722(b)(5).

Procedural History

Fontenelle Hotel Co. filed a petition with the Tax Court, claiming excess profits tax relief for the years 1942-1945. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the claim, and the Tax Court reviewed the case, ultimately siding with the Commissioner. The decision was reviewed by a Special Division of the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the amended lease contract and the competition from a new hotel constituted factors that resulted in an inadequate standard of normal earnings during the base period, entitling the taxpayer to relief under Section 722(b)(5).

Holding

1. No, because the amended lease and competition from a new hotel were not factors that would entitle the taxpayer to relief under Section 722(b)(5).

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court relied heavily on the prior case of *George Kemp Real Estate Co.*, which denied relief under Section 722(b)(5) where a lessor reduced rentals due to the general business depression. The court reasoned that competition is a normal and expected part of doing business. The fact that a new, modern hotel opened up and provided competition, and that the amended contract reduced the earnings of the hotel, did not meet the criteria for tax relief under the specific provisions of Section 722. The court stated, “Competition is present in almost any business. Instead of it being something unusual, it is quite common. It is of the very essence of our capitalistic system.” Therefore, the factors cited by the taxpayer did not demonstrate an inadequate standard of normal earnings under the law. The court also noted that the amended contract could be seen as establishing the standard of normal earnings. The Court held that to grant relief would be inconsistent with the provisions of 722(b)(3) allowing relief in cases where the taxpayer’s profits cycle differs materially from the general business cycle, since practically all taxpayers were affected by the general business depression.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates that businesses seeking tax relief based on unusual circumstances must demonstrate that these circumstances are not merely typical business experiences like competition or economic downturns. The court’s focus on the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.