Unincorp Bus Pax Determine Cons Breitbart, Rebert S. A-Z

Science Sies, Hearing Officer

ROSERT S. BREITBART

PRETTION FOR HEDETSHMINATION OF A DEFIGIENCY OF UNINCOMPORATED BUSINESS TAXES UNDER ARTICLE 23 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE YEAR 1962

A hearing with reference to the above matter ups held before me at 80 Centre Street, New York City on December 23, 1965. The appearances and evidence produced were as shown in the stemagraphic minutes and the exhibits submitted herewith.

The issue involved herein is whether the activities of the texpaper in consection with real estate management on behalf of three partnerships in which he had a fractional interest and his activities as a licensed insurance broker constitute the carrying on of an unincorporated business subject to unincorporated business tex in accordance with the previsions of Subdivision (c), Section 703, Article 23 of the fax Law.

On Schodule "6" of his rederal income text return for the year 1962, the texpaper, Rebert 5, breithert, reported grove income in the sum of \$22,677.88 from insurance and real extent. He reported business deductions in the sum of \$5,953.47 which consisted of depreciation, rent, stationery and printing, sugges, etc. He reported not indeed from each business for the year 1962 in the sum of \$13,724.41.

During the year 1962 and prior thereto, the taxpayer, Rebert 3. Breitbart was and still is an atterney and licensed incurance tretter, maintaining an effice at 2)3 Breadway, New York Gity. He also owns a fractional interest in feur partnerships which own real property consisting of apartment houses and is an efficer and spectholder of Victorian Boalty Corp., a desertic corporation engaged in the featel of real estate and maintaining an effice at 2)3 Breadway, New York Gity. In 1962 the taxpayer, Robert 3. Breitbart, required legal foce in the sum of \$1,693.02; management fees from the fear real setate partnerships mentioned above in the sum of \$7,479.73, management fees from Medwedge Realty Corp. in the sum of \$1,325.85 and not income from his impurance business in the sum of \$12,679.28. The taxpayer did not file any unincorporated business tax returns for the year 1962. The Incometax Bureau issued a notice of deficiency holding the not income received by the taxpayer from real estate management and incurance in the sum of \$12,231.39 (but excluding the legal fees) subject to unincorporated business tax.

TO: Commissioners Murphy, MacDuff and Conlon

REL ROBERT 3. BREITBARD

In the case of Schirmelster's Estate, 8 A.D. 24 180, reargument and appeal denied V A.D. 24 501, leave to appeal denied V Y.V. 24 708, it was held that the business activities of two brothers, equal owners of stock of five corporations, having extensive real estate holdings, consisting of the handling of various financial and collection services for such corporations and the distribution of themselves of funds in the nature of compensation, constituted "unincorporated business". The opinion of the Appellate Division, by Bergan J., at page 182, states, in part, as follows:

"The handling of financial or collection services for a group of corporations could cortainly be found to be a 'business' in which a service corporation, for example, might be expected to engage; and, of course, the management of real estate as a service would usually be deemed a business."

It is to be noted that the partnerships and the derpopation is their returns, listed the management feet received by the taxpayer at expense deductions. His activities on behalf of said paytneyships and the corporation in connection with his management of the properties held by them consisted of collecting rents, making necessary repairs and paying bills. He maintained an office in connection with said activities and deducted expenses in the operation of said office.

Although the tempeyer contends that he is exempt from unincorporated business tax since he owns a fractional interest in the various partnerships which are engaged in the holding of rental property for their own account, I am of the opinion that the situation is no different than if the taxpayor had rendered such personal services to various corporations. It is to be noted that the taxpayer reported & distributive share of income from one of the partnerships; that the others sustained lesses and that taxpayer deducted his share of such losses. The instant case is to be distinguished from the case of arnold S. and Kirlen Coren. formal hearing determination dated September 27, 1966 (subsequently reseluded). The income there was treated as salary and the taxpayer's relationship with his principals was that of employeremployee for payroll purposes since they deducted withholding taxes and paid social security on his behalf. In the instant case, hevever, the texpayer was not an employee but rather an independent agent and maintained an office deducting expenses in the operation of same. The facts in the instant case are mere skin to those in Schirrecister's Estate, supra-

In Matter of Harris Block (Formal Hearing Determination d. July 21, 1966) it was held that the activities of the taxpayer in real estate management on behalf of various partnerships in which he camed fractional interests consituted the sarrying on of an unincorporated business.

70: Commissioners Murphy, NacDuff and Conlon

REA ROBERT S. BREITBART

PAGE 3

I am of the opinion, therefore, that the activities of the taxpayor, Behert S. Breitbart, in connection with his insurance business and real estate management constituted the carrying on of an unincorporated business within the intent and meaning of Subdivision (\$), Section 70), Article 23 of the Tax Law.

For the reasons stated above, I recommend that the decision of the Tax Commission in this matter be substantially in the form subsitted berevith.

FEB 20 1967

SOLOMON SIES

/s/		والمستني فيعربه والكنب	N SCHAPIRO	
	Approve	4		
/s/		SAUL I	HECKELMAN	
	Anarava			

35:35 3-27-67

the foot can there are now a continued to

And the state of the state of the STATE TAX COURTS STOW

IN THE MATTER OF THE PUBLISHED

8

mounts of builtaken

71le 43-3300309

POR A MEDITERMINATION OF A DEFICIENCY OF FOR METUND OF UNINCOMPORATED MEDITERS THE UNDER ARPECLE 23 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE TEAR 1963

tion of a deficiency or for refund of unincorporated business too under Article 33 of the Tex Low for the year 1962 and a heating having been held in connection therewith at the office of the Pinto Tex Countesion at 80 Contro Street, New York, N.Y. on the 2376 day of December, 1963 before Science Size, Hearing Officer of the Department of Texniles and Finance, at which bearing the temperor was represented by Newbert Cartinbol, Cartified Public Accomment, and the Manter having been duly exemined and countered.

The State Tex Countration hareby finds:

(1) That Robert S. Broitbart and Miles Broitbart, his wife, filed a joint New York State Income Ten return for the year 1962 in which the temporer Robert S. Boultbart reported total veges received from Pose College in the sum of \$7,447.89; that, in addition, the tampayer Robert S. Braithest reported not incume on Cohodule "A", husiness incens received in connection with the husiness of incurence and real estate management in the sum of \$13,724.41; that the afteremuntioned tempeyor did not file ony unincorporated business tem return for the year 1962; that on May 10, 1965 the Department of Townties and Pinence issued a statement of sudit changes against the temptyes, hebert S. Sweltbert, imposing unincorporated business ten on the ant income of the tempeyor from real estate management and incomence upon the ground that the activities of the aforementioned tempoyer in incurates and real estate management constituted the corrying on of an unincorporated business and accordingly issued a notice of deficiency including tex, penalty and interest in the sun of \$197.41; that the income of the tampeyer from the practice of Law was auclinial

from the computation for unincorporated business tax purposes.

- (2) That during the year 1962 and prior thereto, the targager Nobert S. Breithert was and still is an atterney-at-law admitted to practice law in the State of New York and maintained an office in connection with said practice at 232 Breadway, New York City; that the tempoyer's income from the practice of law during the year 1962 assumed to \$1,493.02.
- (3) That dering the year 1963 and prior thereto the tempager was and still is an incurance broker licensed as such by the Insurance Department of the State of New York and conducted his insurance business under the name of Professed Insurance Company at the same address where he conducts his law practice; that during the year 1962, his income from the aforementioned insurance business amounted to \$12,679.38.
- (4) That, in addition, the tempeyer owns a fractional interest in four partnerships which own goal property consisting of aportness and tenement houses, and are engaged in the rental thorses and is an efficar and shareholder of Vicksedge Realty Corp., a demostic corporation organised under the laws of the State of New York engaged in the sental of real estate; that the partnerships and the corporation emistain offices in the same office where the tempeyer is engaged in his law practice and insurance business; that during the year 1962, the tempaper resolved management fees from maid partnerships as fellows: Alten Realty Co., \$860.00; Piecefield Realty Co., \$1,943.18; Morth River Realty Co., 93,487.21 and 2 2 2-176 Co., \$949.34; that during the year 1963 the tampayer revolved from Wicksedge Realty Corp. management foor in the amount of \$1,325.85; that the total management food received by the tempayer during said year answated to \$18,505.50; that the sotivities of the tempayor on bohelf of the pertmerchip and the corporation concluted of the management of the properties ermed by the eferencial entities, collocking rants, arranging for necessary repairs and paying bills: that neither the partnerships nor the corporation deducted Peleral and State withholding terms or paid natial ensurity or unemployment insurance on

4 Th. 18

behalf of the tempeyor.

- (5) That is Schodule C of his Pederal income tex setups for the year 1963, the tempsyor reported deductions in the encont of 68,953.47 which consisted of rest, veges, depreciation, stationary and printing, etc.
- (6) That the tempoyer reported on his income tem return for the year 1963, a distributive share of income from one of the partnerships for whom he had rendered such entate management services and received foce therefor; that the other partnerships from whom the tempoyer received real estate management face services and the tempoyer deducted on his return his properties to chare of such looses.

Pased upon the foregoing findings, and all of the evidence presented herein, the State Tex Commission hereby

DECIDES:

- (A) That the activities of the temporar during the year 1963 as an incurance broker constituted the corrying on of an unincorporated business said the incompandation was subject to unincorporated business ten in accordance with the previous of Section 763, Article 23 of the Ten Law.
- (3) That the artivities of the tampayer during the year 1962 with respect to real estate management, as more fully set forth in Finding (4) above, constituted the carrying on of an uniconspondted business and the income therefrom was subject to unicomperated business tax within the intent and meaning of fortion 763, Article 23 of the Tax Low.
- (C) That accordingly, the Statement of Audit Changes and Setion of Derickowy are correct; that the same do not include any tax or other charge which could not have been laufully demanded, and that the potition of the taxpayer for redetermination of each deficiency

Albany, Now York, on the 12th day of

April

/s/

JOSEPH H. MURPHY

/s/

WALTER MACLYN CONLON

Strabl