Incom Max Determinations
Bernard, anne V. A-Z

Commissioners Murphy, Palestin & Magduff

Solomon Sies, Hearing Officer

ARME V. BERNAUD

Applications for Refunds of Personal Income Taxes for the years 1955, 1956 and 1957 under Article 16 of the Tax Law

A hearing with reference to the above matter was scheduled before me at 80 Centre Street, New York, M. Y. for February 2, 1965. The taxpayer defaulted in appearance at such hearing. The taxpayer and her representative failed to respond to subsequent letters affording them an opportunity to request a rescheduled hearing.

The issue involved herein is whether certain payments received by the taxpayer as beneficiary under employment contracts entered into between her late husband and his employers constituted payments made by reason of the death of an employee taxable pursuant to \$359, subd. 2.a. (2) of the Tax Law, as amended by Chapter 629, Laws of 1956 applicable to returns commencing with the calendar year January 1, 1955.

On January 20, 1945, the taxpayer's late husband J. E. Bernard entered into written agreements with two corporations, J. E. Bernard & Co., Inc., a corporation organized under the State of Illinois and J. E. Bernard & Co. Inc., a domestic corporation, having its principal place of business in the City and State of New York whereby death benefits were to be paid by both corporations to his wife (the taxpayer) and their children upon his death in an annual sum not to be less than the total salary and bonus paid to him during the calendar year preceding his death for a period of two years following such death. The agreements further provided that the corporations would pay the taxpayer an annual sum to be determined by the Board of Directors of said corporations but that said sums were not to be less than one-half (1/2) of the amount paid to the taxpayer's deceased husband during the calendar year preceding his death.

To: Commissioners Murphy, Palestin & Macduff

Re: Anne V. Bernard

-2-

The taxpayer's late husband did not possess, prior to death, a nonforfeitable right to receive the amounts while living. Taxpayer's husband, J. H. Bernard died on June 30, 1955. The taxpayer reported the payments received by her in her 1955, 1956 and 1957 income tax returns. In 1955, the taxpayer received \$6,000.00 and excluded \$5,000.00, reporting the excess amount of \$1,000.00 as taxable income. For the years 1956 and 1957, the amounts received totalling \$22,500.00 and \$22,000.00 respectively were reported by the taxpayer in their entirety. Thereafter, the taxpayer filed applications for refund of the taxes so paid by her.

In <u>Duberstein v. Commissioner</u> and <u>Stanton v. U.S.</u>, 363 U.S. 378, the Supreme Court held that what constituted a gift for for income tax purposes is not to be decided under common law doctrine, but that the term "gift" is used in the Federal income tax law in a more colloquial sense. The court laid down certain broad guide lines for the fact-finder which are summarised in <u>U.S. v. Masynski</u>, 284F. 2d 143. The court there stated as follows:

****Supreme Court in Suberstein did recognize certain duiding principals which should be applied to the facts in determining whether there was a gift. A transfer without consideration is not necessarily a gift within the meaning of the statute. If the payment proceeds primarily from the impulsion of a moral or legal duty or from the incentive of an anticipated economic benefit, it is not a gift. If the transfer results from 'detached and disinterested generosity' arising 'out of affection, respect, admiration, charity or like impulses,' it is a gift. The most critical consideration is a transferor's intention. This requires an objective inquiry in which the hopes and expectations of tax treatments are immaterial. The proper criterion requires determination of the dominant reason for the transfer."

In Law Bureau memorandum of September 10, 1962, (copy attached) interpreting \$359 subd. 2. a. and Article 23 Personal Income Tax Regulations involving voluntary payments to widows of deceased employees it was held that voluntary payments made to widows are taxable whether made prior or subsequent to January 1, 1955 if the payments did not constitute a "gift". However, if the payments made subsequent to January 1, 1955 are considered to be made

· To: Commissioners Murphy, Palestin & Macduff

Re: Anne V. Bernard

-3-

not as a "gift" then the taxpayer would be solely entitled to the benefit of the \$5,000.00 exclusion in accordance with the 1956 amendment to subd. 2a of \$359.

I am of the opinion that the payments received by the taxpayer did not constitute "gifts" in accordance with the fact-finding guide lines set out in <u>Duberstein and Stanton</u>, supra.

The taxpayer's income tax return for 1957 was lost or misplaced and is no longer available. The records pertaining to the taxpayer's payment of her 1957 tax have been destroyed. (See memorandum E. E. Reegan dated September 5, 1962). In my letter to the taxpayer of April 6, 1965, I requested her to submit copies of her returns for the years involved and informed her that she was being afforded a final opportunity to appear at a formal hearing; that in the event, she failed to respond, her default would stand. The taxpayer failed to respond. Since it would be inconsistent to grant the taxpayer a partial refund for 1956 (based on the \$5,000.00 exclusion) and deny her such refund for 1957, (the refund for 1957 cannot be processed without the return) on the same facts. I believe that her applications for refund should be denied in toto.

For the reasons stated above I recommend that the determination of the Tax Commission be substantially in the form submitted herewith.

	APR 29 1965	SOLOMON SIES
	Fair Et & C. C. Sulfa	Hearing Officer
s/	M. SCHAPIRO	
	Approved	
s/	E. H. BEST	·

SS anbl

Approved

STATE OF HEW TORK STATE TAX COMMERCESTOR

IN THE MATERN OF THE APPLICATION

ANNE V. BEREALD

FOR REVISION OR REFUND OF THROUGHL INCOME TAXES UNDER ARTICLE 16 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE THREE 1955, 1956 A 1957

Asso V. Bernerd, the tempeyer herein, having filed applications for revision or refund of personal income tames under Article 16 of the Tax Law for the years 1989, 1986 and 1987 and a notice of hearing having been mailed to her an January 13th, 1965, scheduling a hearing at 80 Centre Street, New York, M.Y. for February 2, 1965 at 2:30 o'clock P.M. before Science Sice, Hearing Officer of the Department of Taxation & Pineses and the tempeyer having defaulted in appearance at the aforementioned echoduled hearing; that subsequent letters having been mailed on March 4th, 1965 and Agril 6th, 1965 to the taxpayer and her representative affording them an opportunity to request a rescheduled hearing; that the taxpayer having failed to respond to such letters and the matter having been duly examined and considered,

The State Tex Commission hereby finds:

(1) That on January 20, 1945, the tampayer's late bushand, Jules E. Bernard, entered into written agreements with two corporations, J. E. Bernard & Co., Inc. a corporation organized under the laws of the tate of Illinois and J. E. Bernard & Co., Inc., a domestic corporation having its gringigal

place of business in the City and State of New York whoseby death benefits were to be gaid by both corporations to his wife (the tampayer herein) and children upon his douth in an annual sum not to be less then the total salary and bonus paid to him during the calendar year preceding his death for a period of two years following such death; that the agreements further provided that the corporations would pay the tampayer as ensuel sum to be determined by the Board of Directors of said corporations but that such sums were not to be less than one-half (1/2) of the emount paid to the texpayer's decreased husband during the colendar year preceding his death; that the aforesaid emounts were to be gaid to the taxpayer during her lifetime and in the event of her death to her two children, pro rete, during their lifetime; that the taxpayor's late barband did not possess, immediately before his death a nonforfaltable right to receive the amounts while living: that the tempeyer's bushend. Jules W. Bernard died on June 10, 1985.

tampayer, her deceased humband and her children owned more than 80% of the value of the outstanding stock of the New York Corporation and more than 60% of the stock in the Illinois Corporation heretofore referred to in finding (1) above; that pursuant to the provisions of the agreements mentioned in finding (1) above, the tampayer received during the years 1938, 1956 and 1957 from J. E. Bernard & Co. Inc., the New York componstion the same of \$3,000.00, \$6,000.00 and \$4,500.00 respectively and from J. E. Bernard & Co. Inc. the Illinois Corporation, the same of \$3,000.00, \$16,500.00 and \$17,500.00 respectively.

- years 1955, 1956 and 1957 in which she reported income received pursuent to the agreements referred to in finding (1) above; that in the year 1955, she received \$6,000.00 and employed \$5,000.00 but reported the excess amount of \$1,000.00 as temple income; that for the years 1956 and 1957, the amounts received by the temperar totalling \$22,500.00 and \$23,000.00 respectively, were reported by her in their entirety; that the tempeyer thereafter filed applications for refund of the temps so gaid by her.
- (4) That the payments made to the texpayer and received by her pursuant to the egrouments more fully set forth in finding (1) above did not constitute tex free gifts excludable from gross income.

Resed upon the foregoing findings and the record as personally constituted, the State Tax Commission hereby

(A) That the tempeyer has failed to establish that she is establish to a refund of taxes due; that, accordingly, there can be no recomputation, resettlement or revision of the tempe for the year 1955, 1956 and 1957 and that the tempeyer's applications with respect thereto be and the same are hereby dealed.

DATED. Albany. But York on the 26th day of August 196 5.

10/

STATE TAX COUNTED LOW

, -,	Propident.
	Cumisoloner
/s/	JAMES R. MACDUFF

JOSEPH H. MURPHY