

## ***Scotten, Dillon Co. v. Commissioner, 73 T. C. 1057 (1980)***

A taxpayer may adjust its ending inventory to reflect a loss in the year it occurs and is discovered, even if there exists a reasonable prospect of reimbursement for the loss.

### **Summary**

Scotten, Dillon Co. sought to deduct a significant inventory loss of Wisconsin leaf tobacco in 1970. The IRS disallowed the deduction citing inadequate records and a potential for reimbursement. The Tax Court allowed the deduction, ruling that inventory adjustments are distinct from deductions under Section 165 and are governed by Section 471. This decision underscores that businesses can reflect inventory losses in their cost of goods sold without waiting for the outcome of potential reimbursement claims, provided the loss is real and verifiable.

### **Facts**

Scotten, Dillon Co. , a manufacturer of tobacco products, stored its tobacco in warehouses managed by its subsidiary, Wisconsin Tobacco Co. (Wisco). In 1970, Scotten, Dillon discovered a significant shortage of Wisconsin leaf tobacco. The shortage was estimated at 43,855 bales, valued at approximately \$934,000. Investigations suggested internal theft by Wisco employees, including its president, vice president, and warehouseman. Scotten, Dillon notified its insurance carrier, Employers-Commercial Union Insurance Co. , about the potential loss covered by their policy. The company also initiated further investigations, which continued into 1971 and 1972. On its 1970 tax return, Scotten, Dillon adjusted its ending inventory downward to reflect the loss, which the IRS later disallowed, asserting inadequate records and a potential for reimbursement.

### **Procedural History**

Scotten, Dillon filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's disallowance of their inventory adjustment. The IRS argued that Scotten, Dillon failed to prove the actual loss and that a reasonable prospect of recovery existed as of December 31, 1970. The Tax Court considered the evidence and legal arguments presented by both parties.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether Scotten, Dillon suffered an actual shortage of Wisconsin leaf tobacco during 1970.
2. Whether the reasonable prospect of recovery test under Section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code applies to the deduction of inventory losses under Section 471.

### **Holding**

1. Yes, because Scotten, Dillon provided sufficient evidence, including physical inventories and records, to demonstrate the shortage of 43,855 bales of Wisconsin leaf tobacco in 1970.
2. No, because the reasonable prospect of recovery test under Section 165 does not apply to inventory adjustments governed by Section 471, allowing Scotten, Dillon to adjust its ending inventory downward despite potential reimbursement.

### **Court's Reasoning**

The Tax Court found that Scotten, Dillon had adequately proven the actual loss of tobacco inventory through physical inventories and corroborating records. The court rejected the IRS's argument that the absence of a physical inventory at all warehouses was fatal to Scotten, Dillon's claim, noting that the company had taken reasonable steps to verify the shortage. Regarding the applicability of the reasonable prospect of recovery test, the court distinguished between deductions under Section 165 and inventory adjustments under Section 471. It cited regulations that exclude casualty and theft losses reflected in inventories from the Section 165 rules, emphasizing that inventory adjustments are necessary to accurately reflect income and that potential reimbursements should be treated as income in later years if received. The court also noted that requiring businesses to wait for reimbursement before adjusting inventories could lead to misrepresentations in financial reporting.

### **Practical Implications**

This decision clarifies that businesses can adjust their ending inventories to reflect actual losses in the year they occur, even if there is a potential for reimbursement. This is significant for businesses required to keep inventories for tax purposes, as it allows them to accurately report their cost of goods sold without waiting for the resolution of insurance or other claims. The ruling underscores the importance of maintaining accurate inventory records and conducting physical inventories to substantiate losses. It also impacts how the IRS and taxpayers approach the treatment of inventory losses in audits, potentially affecting how similar cases are analyzed. Subsequent cases, such as *B. C. Cook & Sons, Inc. v. Commissioner*, have further refined the distinction between inventory adjustments and Section 165 deductions.