City Line Candy & Tobacco Corp. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 141 T. C. 414 (2013) (United States Tax Court, 2013)

In City Line Candy & Tobacco Corp. v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that the taxpayer, a cigarette wholesaler, must include the cost of cigarette tax stamps in its gross receipts for determining eligibility for the small reseller exception under I. R. C. sec. 263A. The court clarified that these costs are indirect and must be capitalized under the UNICAP rules, impacting how businesses calculate their gross receipts and inventory costs for tax purposes.

Parties

City Line Candy & Tobacco Corp. (Petitioner) filed a petition against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) challenging the Commissioner's notice of deficiency for the taxable years ending October 31, 2004, and October 31, 2006.

Facts

City Line Candy & Tobacco Corp. , a New York corporation, operates as a licensed wholesale dealer and stamping agent for cigarettes. New York law requires all cigarettes intended for sale to bear a tax stamp, which stamping agents like City Line must purchase and affix to the cigarette packs. City Line's business involves purchasing unstamped cigarettes, affixing tax stamps, and reselling the cigarettes to subjobbers and retailers. The cost of these tax stamps, set at $1. 50 per pack by New York State and New York City during the relevant years, was included in the sale price of the cigarettes as mandated by state law. City Line used the accrual method of accounting and reported its gross receipts for tax purposes by subtracting the cost of the cigarette tax stamps from its total sales revenue, a practice it did not follow in its financial statements.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency to City Line, determining deficiencies in its Federal income tax for the taxable years ending October 31, 2004, and October 31, 2006, asserting that City Line had underreported its gross receipts by not including the cost of the cigarette tax stamps. City Line challenged this determination in the U. S. Tax Court. The court's standard of review was de novo for legal issues and clearly erroneous for factual findings.

Issue(s)

Whether the cost of cigarette tax stamps should be included in gross receipts for determining eligibility under the small reseller exception of I. R. C. sec. 263A(b)(2)(B)?

Whether the cigarette tax stamp costs are indirect costs that must be capitalized

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

under the UNICAP rules of I. R. C. sec. 263A?

Whether the Commissioner properly allocated a portion of the cigarette tax stamp costs to City Line's ending inventory using the simplified resale method?

Rule(s) of Law

Under I. R. C. sec. 263A, taxpayers must capitalize certain direct and indirect costs allocable to property acquired for resale. The small reseller exception under I. R. C. sec. 263A(b)(2)(B) exempts taxpayers from these rules if their average annual gross receipts for the three preceding taxable years do not exceed $10 million. Treas. Reg. sec. 1. 263A-3(b)(2)(i) defines gross receipts for this purpose as the total amount derived from all trades or businesses under the taxpayer's method of accounting. Indirect costs include taxes attributable to labor, materials, supplies, equipment, land, or facilities used in resale activities per Treas. Reg. sec. 1. 263A-1(e)(3)(ii)(L).

Holding

The Tax Court held that the cost of cigarette tax stamps must be included in City Line's gross receipts for purposes of the small reseller exception under I. R. C. sec. 263A(b)(2)(B). The court also ruled that these costs are indirect costs that must be capitalized under the UNICAP rules, and the Commissioner's use of the simplified resale method to allocate these costs to City Line's ending inventory was proper.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that under City Line's accrual method of accounting, the entire sale price of cigarettes, including the cost of the tax stamps, constituted gross receipts. New York law required the inclusion of stamp costs in the sale price, thus supporting the court's decision to include these costs in gross receipts for tax purposes. The court rejected City Line's argument to exclude these costs based on the tax's ultimate imposition on consumers, finding no legal support for such a contention. Regarding the capitalization of stamp costs, the court determined they were indirect costs incurred due to City Line's resale activities and attributable to materials used in resale, thus falling under the UNICAP rules. The court also found the Commissioner's application of the simplified resale method to be reasonable and within the discretion granted under I. R. C. sec. 446(b) to ensure a clear reflection of income.

Disposition

The Tax Court's decision affirmed the Commissioner's determination that City Line did not qualify for the small reseller exception and must capitalize the cigarette tax stamp costs under the UNICAP rules. The court ordered that the decision be entered under Rule 155 of the Tax Court Rules of Practice and Procedure, allowing for further computations if necessary.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Significance/Impact

This case clarifies the inclusion of certain taxes in gross receipts for the purpose of the small reseller exception and the capitalization of indirect costs under the UNICAP rules. It impacts how businesses, particularly those in industries subject to similar taxes, calculate their gross receipts and inventory costs for tax purposes. The decision emphasizes the importance of adhering to the taxpayer's method of accounting for tax reporting and reinforces the Commissioner's authority to reconstruct income using reasonable methods when a taxpayer's method does not clearly reflect income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.