STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition	
of	
CRANE'S COUSINS (Seller)	:
a Redetermination of a Deficiency or	:
evision of a Determination or a Refund	

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or : a Revision of a Determination or a Refund of Sales and Use : Taxes under Article(s) 28 & 29 of the Tax Law for the XEXX(S)XXX Period(x) : November 30, 1969 through November 30, 1972.

State of New York County of Albany

Violet Walker , being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 24th day of June , 1977, she served the within Notice of Decision by (created first) mail upon Crane's Cousins

(representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding,

by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed Crane's Cousins as follows: C/O Morris Jaffe Longview Lane Chappaqua, New York

and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a (post office or official depository) under the exclusive care and custody of the United States Postal Service within the State of New York.

That deponent further says that the said addressee is the (representative without petitioner herein and that the address set forth on said wrapper is the last known address of the (representative sof sthe) petitioner.

Sworn to before me this

24th day of June , 1977.

and mack

Hoffer

TA-3 (2/76)



STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

STATE TAX COMMISSION

٢

TAX APPEALS BUREAU STATE CAMPUS ALBANY, N.Y. 12227

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

June 24, 1977

TELEPHONE: (518) 457-1723

Crane's Cousins c/o Morris Jaffe Longview Lane Chappaqua, New York

DECISION Please take notice of the of the State Tax Commission enclosed herewith.

Please take further notice that pursuant to Section(s) 1138 & 1243 of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced within 4 months from the date of this notice.

Inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision or concerning any other matter relative hereto may be addressed to the undersigned. Thev will be referred to the proper party før

> coburn vising Tax Hearing Officer

Enc.

cc:

Yerners Kerre

Taxing Bureau's Representative:

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of CRANE'S COUSINS (SELLER) for Revision of a Determination or for Refund of Sales and Use Taxes under Articles 28 and : 29 of the Tax Law for the Period November 30, 1969 through November 30, 1972.

Petitioner, Crane's Cousins, Inc. (seller), through Morris Jaffe, individually and as an officer of Crane's Cousins, Inc., Longview Lane, Chappaqua, New York, has filed a petition for revision of a determination or for refund of sales and use taxes under Articles 28 and 29 of the Tax Law for the period November 30, 1969, through November 30, 1972. (File No. 10079.) A formal hearing was held before Archibald F. Robertson, Jr., Hearing Officer, at the office of the State Tax Commission, Two World Trade Center, New York, New York, on November 30, 1976, at 2:45 p.m. Petitioner appeared <u>pro se</u>. The Sales Tax Bureau appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq. (Richard Kaufman, Esq., of Counsel.)

ISSUES

I. Whether those activities of petitioner which involve incorporating a hairpiece into a customer's hair constitute "installing tangible personal property" within the meaning of Tax Law §1105(c)(3). II. Whether those activities of petitioner which involve styling hair with an incorporated hairpiece constitute "maintaining, servicing or repairing tangible personal property" within the meaning of Tax Law sec. 1105(c)(3).

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner's activities at issue are found to be the creating of hairstyles involving a hairpiece incorporated into the customer's natural hair. Usually petitioner incorporates the hairpiece, but occasionally the hairpiece has already been incorporated, either by petitioner on a prior occasion, or by another.

2. The size of the hairpiece used varies from a wiglet (the equivalent of ten percent of the customer's hair) to a full sized wig. The process is the same for all, hence all are within the term "hairpiece". (Petitioner also sells hairpieces to customers, and collects sales tax on each sales transaction.)

3. A demonstration showed that the incorporation of the hairpiece into the natural hair is a complex, sophisticated process which accounts for a significantly higher price than that of the same hair styling without the hairpiece.

4. The bobby pins, rollers, and other such implements can be distinguished from the wiglet, in that they serve as tools for petitioner which, for the most part, are removed at the completion of

-2-

the styling and remain with petitioner. The hairpiece, by contrast, becomes a permanent part of the hair for the duration of the setting, and is tangible personal property within the meaning of Tax Law sec. 1105(c)(3).

5. Petitioner's styling services upon a customer's hair with a hairpiece incorporated in it are unique. Significant skill is required of petitioner to create the desired styling effect.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. That Tax Law sec. 1105(c)(3) is applicable to activities of petitioner in which a hairpiece, sold to the customer or supplied by the customer, is incorporated into the customer's natural hair by the petitioner, this activity constituting the "installing of tangible personal property".

B. That sec. 1105(c)(3) is also applicable to activities of petitioner in which petitioner on a prior occasion, or a party other than petitioner, has installed the hairpiece, petitioner's activities being limited to the styling of the customer's hair with hairpiece in place, this activity constituting a "maintaining" or "servicing" of "tangible personal property", and that, therefore, petitioner's application is denied.

DATED: Albany, New York June 24, 1977

STATE TAX COMMISSION	
PRESIDENT	
COMMESSIONER	

COMMISSIONER

-3--