Arrow Fastener Co. , Inc. v. Commissioner, 76 T. C. 431 (1981)

Treasury regulations cannot contradict clear statutory language defining qualified export assets for Domestic International Sales Corporations (DISCs).

Summary

In Arrow Fastener Co. , Inc. v. Commissioner, the Tax Court invalidated a Treasury regulation that attempted to limit the amount of Export-Import Bank obligations considered as qualified export assets for DISCs. The regulation required that the adjusted bases of these obligations not exceed accumulated DISC income. The court found the regulation invalid because it conflicted with the clear statutory language of section 993(b)(7), which explicitly included all Export-Import Bank obligations as qualified export assets without any such limitation. This decision emphasized that the Commissioner's regulatory power does not extend to amending unambiguous statutory provisions.

Facts

Arrow Fastener Co. , Inc. , and its subsidiaries, Arrow Fastener Sales Corp. and Arrow Fastener International, Ltd. , were involved in manufacturing and exporting stapling machines and staples. Both subsidiaries elected to be treated as DISCs under section 992(b). They invested in Export-Import Bank obligations, which were listed as assets on their tax returns. The Commissioner disallowed their DISC status for 1973, arguing that the adjusted bases of these obligations exceeded their accumulated DISC income, thus failing to meet the 95% qualified export assets requirement under section 1. 993-2(h)(2) of the Income Tax Regulations.

Procedural History

The case was submitted to the U. S. Tax Court on a fully stipulated basis. The court reviewed the validity of the regulation limiting Export-Import Bank obligations as qualified export assets and determined that the regulation was invalid, thereby reversing the Commissioner's determination of deficiencies in the petitioners' Federal income taxes.

Issue(s)

1. Whether section 1. 993-2(h)(2) of the Income Tax Regulations, which limits the amount of Export-Import Bank obligations that can be considered qualified export assets, is valid.

Holding

1. No, because the regulation conflicts with the clear and unambiguous language of section 993(b)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code, which includes all Export-Import Bank obligations as qualified export assets without limitation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court’s decision hinged on the principle that Treasury regulations must be consistent with the statute they interpret. The court cited section 993(b)(7), which explicitly lists Export-Import Bank obligations as qualified export assets without any limitation. The court emphasized that Congress deliberately chose to include these obligations without restrictions, unlike other assets where limitations were specified. The court rejected the Commissioner’s argument that the regulation was necessary to ensure that DISCs were substantially engaged in exporting, noting that Congress had already addressed this concern through other statutory provisions. The court concluded that the Commissioner overstepped his authority by promulgating a regulation that effectively amended the statute. The court also considered legislative history, which did not support the Commissioner’s limitation on Export-Import Bank obligations.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that Treasury regulations cannot impose additional limitations on statutory definitions of qualified export assets for DISCs when the statute is clear and unambiguous. Practitioners should carefully review statutory language when advising clients on DISC status and investment strategies. The ruling may encourage more aggressive investment in Export-Import Bank obligations by DISCs, potentially impacting their tax planning and financial strategies. Businesses considering DISC status should be aware that the court’s decision limits the Commissioner’s ability to narrow statutory definitions through regulations, thereby providing more certainty in planning. Subsequent cases have reinforced this principle, emphasizing the importance of statutory clarity in regulatory interpretation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.