

Arkansas Best Corp. v. Commissioner, 78 T. C. 432 (1982)

An accrual method taxpayer must include income from state and local tax refunds in the year the right to those refunds is ultimately determined, and a bad debt deduction from a guaranty is allocable to foreign source income if the loan proceeds were used abroad.

Summary

Arkansas Best Corp. contested the IRS's determination of a \$394,887 income tax deficiency for 1972, arguing that it should not include potential New York State and City tax refunds in its 1975 income due to uncertainty about their allowance, and that a bad debt deduction from a loan guarantee to its German subsidiary should be allocated to U. S. sources. The Tax Court held that the refunds should be included in income when their right is determined, not before, and that the bad debt deduction was allocable to foreign source income since the loan proceeds were used in Germany. This decision impacts how accrual method taxpayers account for tax refunds and how deductions are allocated for foreign tax credit purposes.

Facts

Arkansas Best Corp. , using the accrual method of accounting, filed consolidated Federal corporate income tax returns for 1972 and 1975. In 1975, it incurred a net operating loss and sought to carry it back to 1972, claiming refunds for New York State franchise and New York City general corporation taxes. It also guaranteed a loan to its wholly owned German subsidiary, Snark Products GmbH, which defaulted, leading to a bad debt deduction. The IRS argued that the tax refunds should be included in 1975 income and that the bad debt deduction should be allocated to foreign source income.

Procedural History

The IRS determined a deficiency in Arkansas Best Corp. 's 1972 Federal income tax. The case was fully stipulated and presented to the U. S. Tax Court, which decided the issues of when to accrue tax refunds and how to allocate the bad debt deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether an accrual method taxpayer must include in its 1975 gross income amounts representing refunds of New York State franchise taxes and New York City general corporate taxes for 1972, attributable to a net operating loss carryback from 1975.
2. Whether the bad debt deduction resulting from the taxpayer's payment on its guaranty of a loan to its wholly owned foreign subsidiary is allocable to foreign source income, thereby reducing the maximum allowable foreign tax credit available.

Holding

1. No, because the right to the refunds was not ultimately determined until after 1975, and thus, they should not be included in the taxpayer's income for that year.
2. Yes, because the bad debt deduction was incurred to derive income from a foreign source, as the loan proceeds were used by the subsidiary in Germany.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the "all events" test under section 1. 451-1(a) of the Income Tax Regulations, determining that the right to the tax refunds was not fixed until the taxing authorities certified the overassessment, which had not occurred by the end of 1975. The court rejected the IRS's position that it was "reasonable to expect" certification, especially given the dependency of New York taxes on Federal tax decisions. For the bad debt deduction, the court applied sections 861 and 862, finding that the deduction should be allocated to foreign source income because the loan's purpose was to provide working capital for the German subsidiary. The court cited cases like *Motors Ins. Corp. v. United States* and *De Nederlandsche Bank v. Commissioner* to support its reasoning on allocation, emphasizing that the deduction must be matched to the source of income it was incurred to generate.

Practical Implications

This decision informs how accrual method taxpayers should account for state and local tax refunds, requiring them to wait until the right to the refund is determined before including it in income. It also clarifies that deductions, such as bad debts, should be allocated based on the income source they are intended to generate, which can impact foreign tax credit calculations. Legal practitioners must consider these principles when advising clients on tax planning and compliance, particularly those with international operations. Subsequent cases like *Motors Ins. Corp. v. United States* have applied similar reasoning in allocating deductions to foreign income.