32 T.C. 1050 (1959)

To qualify for excess profits tax relief under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, a taxpayer must demonstrate a causal connection between the qualifying factors and an increased level of earnings during the base period.

Summary

The Green Lumber Company sought relief from excess profits taxes under Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The company, formed in 1937, argued its business was new and had not reached its earning potential during the base period. It also claimed its base period was depressed due to conditions in the non-farm residential construction industry. The Tax Court denied relief, finding Green Lumber failed to establish a causal link between its qualifying factors and increased earnings, particularly in relation to its sales of prefabricated buildings to the CCC. The court also ruled that the company could not raise a claim of inadequate invested capital for the first time on brief. Finally, the court determined the company was not a member of the residential construction industry. The court ultimately ruled in favor of the Commissioner, denying Green Lumber Company's claims for tax relief.

Facts

Green Lumber Company, a Delaware corporation, was organized in September 1937. It took over the lumber concentration yard operations of Eastman, Gardiner and Company (E-G) after E-G liquidated. Green Lumber operated a concentration yard and produced oak flooring, boxes, lath, and prefabricated buildings for the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). E-G's operations included its own timber stands and a band mill. E-G experienced losses in the late 1920s and early 1930s. In 1935, E-G secured significant contracts to sell prefabricated buildings to the CCC. The CCC contracts were sporadic, limited to 1 or 2 years. Green Lumber took over the facilities in 1937. Green Lumber's tax returns for the years in question showed the company's business included remanufacturing lumber and prefabrication. Green Lumber produced experimental prefabricated residential units in 1939, which it sold to employees, but had not been able to establish a successful residential construction business. During the base period, Green Lumber's revenue was generated from sales of lumber and from prefabricated buildings for the CCC, primarily in 1939.

Procedural History

The Green Lumber Company filed claims for relief under Section 722 for excess profits taxes for the years 1940, 1941, and 1942. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed these claims. The taxpayer then brought a case in the United States Tax Court, seeking a constructive average base period net income to reduce its excess profits taxes. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Green Lumber Company was entitled to relief under Section 722(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code because it commenced business during the base period and the average base period net income did not reflect normal operations for the entire base period.

2. Whether Green Lumber Company was entitled to relief under Section 722(c)(3) based on the inadequacy of its invested capital.

3. Whether Green Lumber Company was entitled to relief under Section 722(b)(2) or 722(b)(3)(A) based on conditions in the non-farm residential construction industry.

Holding

1. No, because the taxpayer failed to show a causal connection between commencing business or a change in the character of the business and increased earnings during the base period.

2. No, because the taxpayer did not assert this claim in its original application, petition, or at trial.

3. No, because the taxpayer failed to prove it was a member of the non-farm residential construction industry.

Court's Reasoning

The court found that the mere existence of qualifying factors under Section 722 did not automatically entitle a taxpayer to relief. The court emphasized the necessity of demonstrating a causal connection between these factors and an increased level of earnings. The court noted the sales of prefabricated buildings to the CCC did provide a major revenue source for Green Lumber in 1939. However, the court found those sales were not related to Green Lumber's commencement of business or any change in the character of the business. The court found the 1939 sales resulted from the Government's reentry into a market where Green Lumber was equipped and prepared. The court considered whether the taxpayer had commenced a new line of business – residential construction – but found that Green Lumber had only considered this activity and produced only two prototype units. Regarding invested capital, the court noted that the argument was first raised on brief and therefore was not properly before the court. The court also determined the taxpayer was not a member of the non-farm residential construction industry, as the company did not produce homes but provided parts for buildings, failing to qualify for relief under Section 722(b)(2) or (3)(A). The court cited *Michael Schiavone & Sons, Inc.* and *Morgan Construction Co.*, in which relief was denied where the increase in business volume could not be causally linked to the taxpayer's efforts.

Practical Implications

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

This case underscores the crucial importance of establishing a direct causal relationship between a taxpayer's circumstances and any alleged economic hardship or unrealized earning potential when seeking excess profits tax relief. Taxpayers must provide evidence that their specific actions or changes, such as a change in the character of business, led to an increase in earnings during the relevant base period. This requires detailed documentation and analysis. Furthermore, the case highlights that a claim for tax relief must be raised at the earliest opportunity; new theories or grounds for relief cannot be introduced on brief, and all claims for relief should be explicitly stated from the start of any tax litigation. Finally, the decision reinforces the need for taxpayers to prove that they meet the conditions of an industry they claim to be part of in order to prove its economic hardship. Legal practitioners should pay close attention to the required burden of proof, the timing of claims, and the need to demonstrate a connection between actions and results. Later cases have cited the case for its rigorous standard of causation for excess profits tax relief, and for the requirement that a taxpayer must be a member of a qualifying industry. The case serves as a warning about the narrow scope of relief under Section 722, and that taxpayers must be diligent in presenting a complete case for relief. The court's emphasis on the specific facts and circumstances of the business and any changes affecting earnings is notable.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.