STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COMMISSION ALBANY, NEW YORK 12227

September 28, 1983

Manufacturers Hanover, Trust ATTN: Thomas J. Hanss, V.P. 183 E. Main St., Central Region Rochester, NY 14604

Gentlemen:

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

You have now exhausted your right of review at the administrative level. Pursuant to section(s) 1138 of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision by the State Tax Commission can only be instituted under Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules, and must be commenced in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Albany County, within 4 months from the date of this notice.

Inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision may be addressed to:

NYS Dept. Taxation and Finance Law Bureau - Litigation Unit Building #9 State Campus Albany, New York 12227 Phone # (518) 457-2070

Very truly yours,

STATE TAX COMMISSION

cc: Taxing Bureau's Representative

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of Manufacturers Hanover, Trust

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

for Redetermination of a Deficiency or a Revision of a Determination or a Refund of Sales & Use Tax under Article 28 & 29 of the Tax Law for the Period 3/1/77-2/29/80.

State of New York County of Albany

Connie Hagelund, being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is an employee of the State Tax Commission, over 18 years of age, and that on the 28th day of September, 1983, she served the within notice of Decision by certified mail upon Manufacturers Hanover, Trust, the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows:

Manufacturers Hanover, Trust ATTN: Thomas J. Hanss, V.P. 183 E. Main St., Central Region Rochester, NY 14604

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 petitioner herein and that the address set forth on said wrapper is the last known address of the petitioner.

Couri O. Hageliel

Sworn to before me this 28th day of September, 1983.

AUTHORIZED TO ADMINISTER OATHS PURSUANT TO TAX LAW SECTION 174

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

MANUFACTURERS HANOVER, N.A.

DECISION

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 March 1, 1977 through February 29, 1980.

Petitioner, Manufacturers Hanover, N.A., 183 East Main Street, Central Region, Rochester, New York 14604, 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 March 1, 1977 through February 29, 1980 (File No. 31446).

A small claims hearing was held before John F. Koagel, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, 1 Marine Midland Plaza, Room 1300, Rochester, New York 14604, on March 9, 1983, at 2:45 P.M. Petitioner appeared by Thomas J. Hanss, Senior Vice President and Secretary and Michael J. Beyma, Vice President and Counsel. The Audit Division appeared by John P. Dugan, Esq. (Thomas C. Sacca, Esq., of counsel).

ISSUE

Whether certain monies paid by petitioner were taxable rental payments or non-taxable payments of principal and interest against a loan.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On June 13, 1980, as a result of a field audit, Manufacturers Hanover
Trust Company/Central Region, a New York State Chartered Bank, was issued a
Notice of Determination and Demand for Payment of Sales and Use Taxes Due for

The Cartier of the Control of the Co

The state of the s

And the first of t

The section of the se

. .

en kompanis er en som en statt som <mark>en som en s</mark>om en kompanis til som en so tax of \$8,881.60 plus interest of \$1,360.91 for a total of \$10,242.51. Said Notice covered the period March 1, 1977 through February 29, 1980.

- 2. On January 1, 1982, Manufacturers Hanover N.A. (hereinafter petitioner)
 became the correct successor of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company/Central New
 York or, as listed on the above Notice, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company/Central
 Region.
- 3. In 1973, Manufacturers Hanover Corporation (hereinafter "parent"), a bank holding corporation, purchased the assets of the State Bank of Ontario in order to expand its banking operations in the banking district serving the Rochester area. As a result of this acquisition, petitioner originated and became a wholly owned subsidiary of parent and began its business operations at 183 E. Main Street, Rochester, New York and at several branch locations with a first year capital contribution from parent in the approximate amount of \$900,000.00.
- 4. In order to operate at its various locations, petitioner had to obtain a wide variety of fixed assets which, for the most part, were furniture and fixtures. Petitioner testified that it was restricted in purchasing the required assets in the following two ways:
 - a) The New York State Banking Law limited petitioner, by percentage of capital, on what it could spend for furniture, fixtures, equipment, land improvements, etc. The percentage would have been exceeded if the required assets were purchased.
 - b) At the time in question, Federal law prohibited financial transactions of any nature between sister banks (banks with the same parent corporation); petitioner had one sister bank, that being Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company.

However, as parent did not engage in banking activities, there was no restriction concerning financial transactions (loans, etc.) between parent and petitioner.

 $(2.179 \pm 0.54) \times (2.59 \pm 0.5) \times (2.18 \pm 0.5) \times (2$ The transfer of the contract \mathcal{C}^{*} is the second \mathcal{C}^{*} . The contract \mathcal{C}^{*} gradient in the control of the contr and the state of t the control of the state of the

and the state of t to the state of th and the second of the second The contract of the profession of the profession of the contract of the contra the state of the s The second of the second of the second secon the second of 100

ide om bod kesamine ji me dispolitika i kalendi. A tide tide ide identi. care with a tree of the contract of the contra in the control of the control of the second of the control of the $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, \dots, x_{n-1}, \dots, x_{n-1}, \dots, x_n) = 0$

the first three the second of the second of

The state of the s er 😚 in grande in the state of

and the second control of the second process of the second

- 5. In order to obtain the required fixed assets, parent purchased the fixed assets required by petitioner. Petitioner immediately took possession of the fixed assets, most of which at petitioner's main office at 183 E. Main Street, Rochester, New York. The assets were purchased between the fall of 1973 and March of 1974. Parent never had possession of the assets in question.
- 6. Payments were made by petitioner to parent on a quarterly basis which commenced approximately one year from when the first of the assets were purchased by parent. Payments were computed based upon the amount the assets depreciated during the payment quarter plus interest on the assets' undepreciated amount. The Audit Division considered these payments as rental payments and assessed tax on them in the amount reflected in Finding of Fact 1, that being \$8,881.60.
- 7. Petitioner alleged that the payments were simply intercompany payments against a non-recourse loan, plus interest, and that the loan was made probably because parent did not want to make an additional capital contribution to petitioner.
- 8. There is no written agreement concerning or controlling the payments in question; there was no evidence introduced to show the existence of a security agreement.
- 9. Petitioner testified that the payments were to continue until the value of the assets, with a useful life of seven years, and the interest were fully paid at which time ownership of the assets would be transferred to petitioner.
- 10. Petitioner testified that parent paid sales tax on the purchase of the assets; however there was no documentary evidence shown reflecting sales tax payment nor was there any evidence presented to indicate what effect such sales tax payment would have on the transactions in the instant case.

The section of the

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. That section 1105(a) of the Tax law imposes a sales tax on the receipts from every retail sale of tangible personal property with certain exceptions, none of which appear in the instant case.

That section 1101(b)(4) of the Tax law defines a retail sale as a sale of tangible personal property to any person for any purpose with certain exceptions, none of which appear in the instant case.

That section 1101(b)(5) defines sale, selling or purchase as:

"Any transfer of <u>title</u> or <u>possession</u> or <u>both</u>, exchange or barter, <u>rental</u>, <u>lease</u> or <u>license</u> to use or consume, conditional or otherwise, in any manner or by any means whatsoever for a <u>consideration</u>, or any agreement therefore, including the rendering of any service, taxable under this article, for a consideration or any agreement therefor." (emphasis added).

That regulation 20 NYCRR 526.7(b) states that consideration "...includes monetary consideration, exchange, barter, the rendering of any service, or any agreement therefor. Monetary consideration includes assumption of liabilities, fees, rentals, royalties or any other charge that a purchaser, lessee or licensee is required to pay". (emphasis added).

B. That the monies paid by petitioner to parent for the depreciable value of the fixed assets in the possession of and used by petitioner plus interest on the undepreciated amount of those fixed assets are taxable rentals within the meaning and intent of sections 1105 and 1101 of the Tax Law; that petitioner has not shown or attempted to show that the transaction(s) involved a non-taxable security agreement as provided for in regulation 20 NYCRR 526.7(c)(3).

Was I will a district

(a) The second of a consistency of the second of the se

entro o como de la como de tradesta de la como de tradesta de la como de la como de tradesta de la como de tradesta de la como della como de la como del la como de la como della como dell

BUT BUT OF THE WEST TOWN OF THE STANDARD OF TH

Assert Autonomical Control (1997) and the second of the se

ence de la companya del companya de la companya de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la companya de la companya de la companya de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la companya de la companya de la companya del companya de la company

C. That the petition of Manufacturers Hanover N.A. is denied and the Notice of Determination and Demand for Payment of Sales and Use Taxes Due issued on June 13, 1980 is sustained.

DATED: Albany, New York

SEP 28 1983

STATE TAX COMMISSION

PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

P 481 208 239 RECEIPT FOR CERTIFIED MAIL

NO INSURANCE COVERAGE PROVIDED— NOT FOR INTERNATIONAL MAIL

(See Reverse)			
Sent to Manufacturers ATTN: Thomas J. Han	Hanor 35 1	ver, Ti	n.
Street and No. 183 E. Main St. Cz. P.O., State and ZIP Code			, ,
Rochester, NY 1			
Postage	\$		
Certified Fee			
Special Delivery Fee			
Restricted Delivery Fee			1
Return Receipt Showing to whom and Date Delivered			1
Return Receipt Showing to whom, Date, and Address of Delivery			1
TOTAL Postage and Fees	\$		1
Postmark or Date			
" a			