Brown-Forman Distillers Corp. v. Commissioner, 93 T. C. 152 (1989)

Federal excise taxes on distilled spirits must be included in gross receipts for purposes of calculating the Overall Profit Percentage Limitation (OPPL) under DISC regulations.

Summary

Brown-Forman Distillers Corp. challenged the IRS's determination of tax deficiencies related to its Domestic International Sales Corporation (DISC), Jack Daniel International Co. The central issue was whether gross receipts for the OPPL should be reduced by the federal excise tax on distilled spirits. The court held that these taxes must be included in gross receipts, reasoning that they are production costs, not a separate charge to customers. Additionally, the court upheld the validity of the OPPL regulation and ruled on the permissibility of unilateral aggregation elections for computing the OPPL. The decision clarifies the calculation of gross receipts for tax incentives under the DISC provisions.

Facts

Brown-Forman Distillers Corp. owned subsidiaries Southern Comfort Corp. and Jack Daniel Distillery, which in turn owned Jack Daniel International Co. (JDI), a DISC. Southern Comfort and Jack Daniel produced and sold liqueur and whiskey, respectively, both domestically and for export. JDI operated on a commission basis for export sales. The companies filed amended returns to maximize DISC commissions under the marginal costing method, which required calculating the OPPL. The IRS disallowed deductions claimed by Southern Comfort for commissions paid to JDI, asserting that the federal excise tax on distilled spirits should not be excluded from gross receipts when calculating the OPPL.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency to Brown-Forman Distillers Corp. for tax years ending April 30, 1981, and April 30, 1983. Brown-Forman contested the deficiency in the U. S. Tax Court, which heard the case and rendered a decision on the issues of excise tax inclusion in gross receipts, the validity of the OPPL regulation, and the aggregation rule for computing the OPPL.

Issue(s)

1. Whether "gross receipts" from domestic sales, for purposes of the OPPL, may be reduced to reflect the seller's payment of the federal excise tax on distilled spirits.
2. Whether "gross receipts" for purposes of the OPPL includes amounts attributable to the extinguishment of the excise tax lien on distilled spirits which are exported.
3. Whether section 1. 994-2(b)(3), Income Tax Regs. , imposing the OPPL, is valid.
4. Whether the aggregation rule of section 1. 994-2(c)(2)(ii), Income Tax Regs. , may be applied unilaterally or requires conforming treatment from "related suppliers"

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

with which aggregation is desired.

Holding

1. No, because the federal excise tax on distilled spirits is a production cost and must be included in gross receipts as per section 1. 993-6, Income Tax Regs.
2. No, because the extinguishment of the excise tax lien does not generate additional gross receipts under the relevant tax regulations.
3. Yes, because the OPPL regulation is within the broad delegation of authority granted by section 994(b)(2) and is consistent with the statute's purpose.
4. Yes, because the aggregation rule allows for unilateral election without requiring a conforming election from other related suppliers.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the federal excise tax on distilled spirits is a production cost, not a separate charge to customers, and thus must be included in gross receipts under section 1. 993-6, Income Tax Regs. The court cited Lucky Lager Brewing Co. v. Commissioner, which similarly held that excise taxes should not be excluded from gross receipts. Regarding the extinguishment of the excise tax lien, the court determined that it does not generate additional gross receipts under the tax regulations. The court upheld the validity of the OPPL regulation, stating that it is within the broad delegation of authority under section 994(b)(2) and reasonably allocates indirect costs to export sales. The court also found that the aggregation rule allows for unilateral election, as the regulation's language does not require a conforming election from other related suppliers. The court rejected arguments that the OPPL regulation was inconsistent with the statute's purpose to stimulate exports, noting that it excludes taxpayers with higher export profit margins from using marginal costing, aligning with the statute's intent to incentivize exports.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how companies calculate gross receipts for DISC purposes, requiring the inclusion of federal excise taxes in such calculations. It clarifies that the extinguishment of tax liens does not generate additional gross receipts. The upheld validity of the OPPL regulation means companies must apply this limitation when using marginal costing to compute DISC commissions. The ruling on unilateral aggregation elections provides flexibility for companies with multiple related suppliers. Practitioners should consider these rulings when advising clients on tax planning strategies involving DISCs and when analyzing similar cases. Subsequent cases applying or distinguishing this ruling include those involving other federal excise taxes and different tax incentive programs.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.