Haas Bros. , Inc. v. Commissioner, 73 T. C. 1217 (1980)

Cash discounts negotiated with customers before the sale are adjustments to gross income rather than deductible expenses subject to disallowance under section 162(c)(2).

Summary

Haas Bros. , Inc. , a liquor wholesaler, provided cash discounts to customers in violation of California's Price Posting Laws. The issue was whether these discounts should be treated as adjustments to the sales price (reducing gross income) or as disallowed deductions under section 162(c)(2) for illegal payments. The Tax Court, following the precedent set in Max Sobel Wholesale Liquors v. Commissioner, held that these discounts were adjustments to gross income, not deductions, and thus not subject to disallowance under section 162(c)(2). The decision reaffirmed the Pittsburgh Milk line of cases, distinguishing discounts from illegal payments.

Facts

Haas Bros. , Inc. sold liquor at wholesale in the San Francisco Bay area and was subject to California's Price Posting Laws, which required wholesalers to file and maintain price lists. Haas provided cash discounts to certain customers, negotiated before the sale, which effectively reduced the price below the filed list price. These discounts were not reported to the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, violating state law. Haas did not include these discounts in gross receipts but treated them as deductions from gross sales in its tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Haas Bros. , Inc. 's income tax for the years 1972, 1973, and 1974, claiming the cash discounts were illegal payments disallowed under section 162(c)(2). Haas Bros. , Inc. petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which followed its precedent in Max Sobel Wholesale Liquors v. Commissioner and held that the cash discounts were adjustments to gross income rather than deductions subject to disallowance.

Issue(s)

1. Whether cash payments made by Haas Bros. , Inc. to customers, in violation of state law, constitute adjustments to the sales price of goods sold, thereby reducing gross income, or deductions subject to disallowance under section 162(c)(2).

Holding

1. Yes, because the cash discounts were negotiated as part of the sales transaction and constituted reductions in gross income, not deductions governed by section 162(c)(2).

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the Pittsburgh Milk line of cases, which distinguishes between discounts or rebates that are part of the sales transaction and illegal payments not agreed upon with the buyer. The court rejected the Commissioner’s argument that Pittsburgh Milk was overruled by Tank Truck Rentals and Tellier, citing its continued application in cases like Atzingen-Whitehouse Dairy, Inc. v. Commissioner. The court emphasized that the discounts were agreed upon before the sale, directly reducing the sales price, and were thus adjustments to gross income. The court also noted that Max Sobel Wholesale Liquors v. Commissioner, which involved similar violations of California law, reaffirmed the Pittsburgh Milk doctrine and applied equally to cash discounts as to merchandise credits. The court concluded that these discounts were not deductions governed by section 162(c)(2), which disallows deductions for illegal payments.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that cash discounts negotiated as part of a sales transaction are adjustments to gross income, not subject to the disallowance rules for illegal payments under section 162(c)(2). For businesses, this means that discounts, even if they violate state pricing laws, should be treated as reductions in gross receipts rather than as expenses. Legal practitioners must carefully distinguish between discounts and other types of payments when advising clients on tax treatment. This ruling may encourage businesses to structure discounts as part of the sales transaction to avoid the risk of disallowed deductions. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this principle, reinforcing its impact on tax practice and business operations in industries subject to price regulation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.