Mr. Rook:

Mr. Newman tells me he discussed this case with you and desires you to look it over before submission to the Tax Commission.

5/26/69



AD 53 (2-68)

Mice, The Delermin

12-0-

DATE

OFFICE

3 p. o. america

May 20, 1969

Hearing Unit

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

MEMORANDUM

TO: FROM: SUBJECT:

Mr. Edward Rook Lawrence A. Newman Sheraton Corporation of America Article 11 Mortgage Tax Decision

This hearing held by Mr. Samuel Lorvan in April 1968 involves an interpretation of Section 255 of Article 11 of the Tax Law. The City of New York had collected mortgage tax, penalties, and interest totaling \$15,103.98 from the Sheraton Corporation of America.

The transaction in question involved an original mortgage of \$2,200,000 secured by real property known as the Sheraton-Astor Hotel. Subsequently, the owners of the hotel property contracted to sell the hotel free and clear of this mortgage lien. In order to maintain a security to back up the original mortgage (which was held by a related corporation), the lien of the mortgage was spread to include, in addition, property known as the Sheraton-Ambassador Hotel. On the same day the parties to the mortgage executed a release of lien on the Sheraton-Astor Hotel.

The contention of the Recorder and Corporation Counsel of the City of New York was that in effect the parties through the spreading agreement and release of lien had cancelled the first mortgage and created an entirely new one.

In my opinion, the separation of the terms of the transaction between two documents was done entirely at the option of those persons who had drafted the forms. No apparent legal purpose was served thereby, and the transaction should be viewed in its entirety. In effect, the transaction constitutes a refunding of a mortgage indebtedness and not supplemental, as defined in Section 255.

Therefore, I offer the attached proposed decision, which affirms the position taken by the Recorder of the City of New York, for the approval of the Commission.

Attachment

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Mortgage Executed by: Sheraton-Ambassador Corporation :

DECISION

Sheraton Limited

to

Sheraton Corporation of America having filed a petition to the Tax Commission of the State of New York pursuant to Section 263 of the Tax Law for review of the Determination of the Recording Officer of New York County, and for a refund of a mortgage recording tax in the amount of \$10,301.00, together with interest and penalties in the amount of \$4,802.98 which it is claimed was erroneously collected by the City Register of New York County; and a hearing having been held before Samuel Lorvan, Hearing Officer, on April 24, 1968 at the State Office Building, 80 Centre Street, New York, New York; and the petitioner having appeared by their attorney, Paul V. Wolfe, Esq., and by their Vice President and General Counsel, N. Ronald Silberstein, Esq.; and the Corporation Counsel of the City of New York having appeared by Samuel K. Handel, Esq., special assistant Corporation Counsel.

Now therefore after examination of the record, the profifs and various documents submitted in the proceeding and after due deliberation,

in che Anther of the Mericey Recuted by: serraton-impression Corporates

MOTOLEC

anti-il por man il

. in the second second second second of the second of the second s

ou therefore after examination of the record, the profits and various documents schulter in the recenting and after due fail rector. The State Tax Commission hereby finds:

1. On February 29, 1956, Sheraton-Astor Corporation, a New York corporation, executed in favor of Sheraton Limited, a company incorporated under the laws of Canada, a mortgage to secure indebtedness in the sum of \$2,200,000 which mortgage covered certain real and personal property located in the City of New York, commonly known as the Sheraton-Astor Hotel. Said mortgage was duly recorded in the office of the City Register of New York County. At the time of so recording said mortgage, a recording tax of \$11,000 was paid.

On March 3, 1958 Sheraton-Ambassador Corporation, formerly Sheraton-Astor Corporation, and Sheraton Limited entered into a contract to spread the liens on the property covered by the mortgage of February 29, 1956 to include additional real property commonly known as the Sheraton-Ambassador Hotel, at which time there was indebtedness owing covered by the mortgage in the amount of \$2,060,243.48. The said spreading agreement of March 3, 1958 was accepted as exempt from tax under Section 255 of the Tax Law by the Register of New York County based upon a furnished affidavit of facts, and was recorded on March 4, 1958 in the office of the City Register of New York, County of New York:

On March 3, 1958 Sheraton-Ambassador Corporation and Sheraton Limited executed a release from the lien of mortgage of the real and personal property known as Sheraton-Astor Hotel, and the release was also recorded in the office of the Register of New York, County of New York.

-2-

The tests function of the start of all got

1. Na Ferriery SC, 1955, Shereton-Astor Corporation, a Fer York conference, erecased in Ever of ferrien, Edited, company incorporated, ander the Yest of Janadh, a sectinge
covered octain real and in the second of SC,000.000 value, erectory of New York, consider and a second for the second for the second of New York, consider and a second for the ferries and of New York, a second in the second for the second for the second second for the second for the second for the second second for the second for the second for the second second for the second for the second for the second second for the second for the second for the second second for the second for the second for the second second for the second for the second for the second for Yerk for the second for accelerate second for the second for a second for the second for the second for the second for acceleration for the second for the second for the second for a second for the second for the second for the second for a second for the second for the second for the second for a second for the second for the second for the second for the second for a second for the second for the second for the second for the second for a second for the s

Construction (Contraction (Construction), and (Construction), and (Construction) (Construction), and (Construct), entered (Construction) (Construction) (Construct), conversion to contract (Construction), and on the project conversion to contract, construction (Construction), antisered to the sort of construction (Construction) (Covered to the sort and (Construction), and (Construction), (Covered to the sort and (Construction), (Construction),

ever sere constant de mar seres, son spans par seres a de de demonstration de la serestration de la serestration de de destations de la serestration de la s Serestration de la s

and Shouston - Lotto over the some the solution lies of the montperson of the solution of the

1998 - 19

20

No additional money was loaned, given or delivered by reason of the two agreements dated March 3, 1958. However, a contemporaneous contract existed to sell the Sheraton-Astor Hotel, and deliver title to the said real property to an outside party as purchaser, free and clear of the aforementioned mortgage lien.

-3-

Several years later, on January 20, 1966, Sheraton Limited certified that the mortgage previously referred to in the principal sum of \$2,200,000, which mortgage was, by the terms of a spreading agreement dated March 3, 1958, spread to cover additional real property, was satisfied and paid.

Sheraton Corporation of America owned on January 20, 1966, the property subject to the lien of said mortgage of March 3, 1958, known as the Sheraton-Ambassador Hotel.

When the aforestated mortgage satisfaction was presented to the Register of New York County for recording, he refused to record the same unless a mortgage tax, interest and penalties, was paid in connection with the spreading agreement of March 3, 1958. The amount of the mortgage tax demanded by the Register was that provided for in Section 253 of the Tax Law in the amount of 50¢ for each \$100 on the \$2,060,243.48 of indebtedness owing as stated in the spreading agreement of March 3, 1958, which tax amounted to \$10,301.00. In addition, the interest and penalties demanded were \$4,802.98. > setticite : static variable was infined, that be fully example by rename at the two spects outseld dots said who have been been be consolid datives that to the suid real rubjerty to su outside ruch is succident, fired and there of the two entities and but the situe.

Several test the state of the string of the string settion to the string settion of the settion of

češše, sepo stanjactor, podpisac su 290 što od zapija pozigazi seriga of 1995. – 1950. Sontol, an sto je serigadečiž terester Statistic 1995. – Statistic Statistica, sto sto je serigadečiž terester Statist.

and freezents and the state of an entropy of the state to be a state of the sta

Sheraton Corporation of America paid the tax, penalties and interest totaling \$15,103.98 and protested the payment in writing of the said tax, interest and penalty. The mortgage satisfaction was thereupon accepted by the Register and recorded.

-4-

2. Section 255 of Article 11 of the Tax Law, relating to the mortgage recording tax, provides that "If subsequent to the recording of a mortgage.....an additional mortgage is recorded imposing the lien thereof upon property not originally covered by or not described in such recorded primary mortgage for the purpose of serving the principal indebtedness.....secured by such recorded primary mortgage, such additional instrument or mortgage shall not be subject to taxation under this article, unless it creates or secures a new or further indebtedness or obligation other than the principal indebtedness.....secured by the recorded primary mortgage."

3. In their interpretations of Section 255, the Courts have stressed form above substance. The courts have decided that consolidations of mortgages, changes in parties, maturity dates and/or interest rates may be recorded as exempt from the mortgate recording tax.

In the case before us, the spreading agreement and release of lien were executed by the same parties, on the same day, and filed in the same County office. The separation of ene rise a latter of the sais of there yail the ber, cane rise a latter of the sais rest. States and penelry. ayuant in written of the sais rest. Interest and penelry. The mercage satisfies has been been been accepted of the Regusters as a cortes.

 section 255 of arrists 11 of the Tax Tew, relating to the warnage second for the space as the "It subscapes: to the recordin of a corting to the shirt of this sector sector.
 Is record for the the total total part property not

La brac streaged form the vertical of section 255, the source have streaged form shove substance. The courts have conferently that consolidations of more cases, char as in arting, mathematy detes and on prosents toter new be recorded of erecond free the endited records.

to the chi constant of the second of

the terms of the transaction between two documents was a matter of convenience rather than of form. The transaction must be viewed in its entirety.

Effectively, the original mortgage secured by the Sheraton-Astor property was extinguished and a new mortgage was created and secured by the Sheraton-Ambassador Hotel property.

We conclude that the transaction constitutes a refunding of a mortgage indebtedness and not supplemental as defined in Section 255 of the Tax Law. Therefore, the transaction was subject to the mortgage recording tax to the extent of the total debt outstanding on the date of execution. (Sverdlow v. Bates, 283 A.D. 487; Fifth Avenue 46 Street v. Bragalini, 4 A.D. 2nd 387, Brodsky v. Murphy, 26 A.D. 2nd 225, affirmed 20 N.Y. 2nd 828.)

Now therefore, after due consideration, it is DETERMINED BY THE COMMISSION:

(A) The spreading agreement and release from the lien of mortgage, both dated March 3, 1958, do create and secure a new indebtedness or obligation other than the principal indebtedness secured by the primary mortgage date February 29, 1956.

(B) The aforementioned transactions dated March 3,1958 are subject to the Mortgage Recording Tax.

(C) That the City Collector of New York in New York County had computed the aforementioned Mortgage Recording

-5-

ents of security's logations. If a constant give system to the

sources in the space with the second state of a second to the second state is a second second second second se second second

and in the part of the part

tien of mortgares, both instant instant frank in it for a date of a second of mortgares, both instant of the second of the

in the affordation of about the source water and water in the internation of the source of the sourc

(*) lart the lity balleelour of for fort in New York.

Tax at 50¢ each \$100 on the \$2,060,243.48 of indebtedness owing as stated in the spreading agreement of March 3, 1958.

(b) The sum of \$10,301.00 as Mortgage Recording Tax, and the sum of \$4,802.48 as interest and penalties thereon have been duly and correctly collected by the City Register in New York County.

Now therefore, it is ordered:

1. The determination of the recording officer of New York County disallowing claim for exemption be and the same hereby is confirmed.

2. The application for refund be and the same is hereby denied.

Dated, Albany, New York, the 24th day of June 19 69.

Alm H PRESIDENT COMMISSIONER

(b) The sum of (10, 301, 301, 301, 301) is formate foundary fact, and the sum of \$6,002.5 are interest and an "they arend bays been asky and homeosity oull deced of the thirty toglary b to der home for afty.

The state of the state state of the

1. The decimation of the states of the st

a standard and has been and the standard standard the second standard standard standard standard standards and A standard st

and the second secon

2415 7 el More 2 69