***Faber Cement Block Co. , Inc. v. Commissioner, 50 T. C. 317 (1968)***

A corporation's accumulation of earnings and profits is justified when committed to meet the reasonable needs of the business, including specific and feasible plans for expansion and working capital requirements.

**Summary**

Faber Cement Block Co. was assessed deficiencies for accumulated earnings taxes from 1961 to 1963, but the Tax Court ruled in its favor. The company had accumulated earnings for planned expansion and working capital needs, evidenced by detailed corporate minutes and actual expenditures post-1963. The court found these plans specific, definite, and feasible, thus justifying the accumulations under the reasonable needs of the business standard, as per Section 537 of the Internal Revenue Code. The decision underscores the importance of documenting and implementing business expansion plans to avoid the accumulated earnings tax.

**Facts**

Faber Cement Block Co. , a New Jersey corporation, manufactured cement and cinder blocks. From 1961 to 1963, it accumulated earnings and profits, which were challenged by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the purpose of avoiding shareholder income tax. The company had plans for plant expansion and equipment upgrades, documented in board meeting minutes. It also maintained a no-borrowing policy, funding its operations internally. The company's operations were subject to a local zoning ordinance that classified its activities as a nonconforming use, complicating expansion plans.

**Procedural History**

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency for accumulated earnings taxes for the years 1961, 1962, and 1963. Faber Cement Block Co. petitioned the Tax Court, which ruled in favor of the company, holding that the accumulations were justified by the reasonable needs of the business.

**Issue(s)**

1. Whether Faber Cement Block Co. was availed of for the purpose of avoiding Federal income taxes with respect to its shareholders by accumulating earnings and profits?

**Holding**

1. No, because the court found that the company's earnings and profits were accumulated to meet the reasonable needs of the business, specifically for expansion and working capital, as evidenced by corporate minutes and subsequent expenditures.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

## Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 537 of the Internal Revenue Code, which allows accumulations for reasonably anticipated business needs. The company’s plans for expansion were deemed specific, definite, and feasible under the regulations, despite the zoning challenges. The court considered the corporate minutes, which detailed discussions and resolutions about expansion, as well as the company’s actual expenditures post-1963, which closely matched the planned amounts. The court emphasized that the focus should be on the reasonable needs of the business, not merely on the availability of assets for dividends. The company’s no-borrowing policy and internal financing further supported the need for retained earnings. The court also noted that the company’s working capital requirements, as calculated by both parties, were significant and justified the accumulations.

## Practical Implications

This decision impacts how corporations should document and implement plans for business expansion to avoid the accumulated earnings tax. Corporations must show specific, definite, and feasible plans, even if those plans are subject to external factors like zoning issues. The ruling suggests that a company’s historical spending and subsequent actions can be considered in evaluating the legitimacy of its plans. For legal practitioners, this case highlights the importance of advising clients to maintain detailed corporate records of business plans and to align those plans with actual expenditures. Businesses should be cautious about the timing of expansion plans relative to tax years to ensure accumulations are justified. This case may be cited in future disputes over the accumulated earnings tax to support the argument that accumulations are justified when tied to well-documented and executed business needs.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 