Theise bother, Karl It!

STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COLOUSSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION

MARL V. WEISENMACHER AND HERBERT SCHWEPP INDIVIDUALLY AND AS CO-PARTHERS 4/b/a MARL V. WEISENMACHER & ASSOCIATES

POR REDETERMINATION OF A BEFIGIRECY OR FOR REPURD OF UNINCORPORATED MUSI-HESS TAXES UNDER ARTIGLE 23 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE YEAR 1963

The taxpayers herein having filed a petition for redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of unincorporated business taxes imposed under article 23 of the Tax Law for the year 1963 and a hearing having been held in connection therewith at the office of the State Tax Commission, 30 Centre Street, New York, New York on November 25, 1968, before Solomon Sies, Nearing Officer of the Department of Taxation and Finance, at which hearing the taxpayers were represented by Ferdimand Manner, accountant and auditor and the record having been examined and considered.

The State Tax Commission hereby finds:

(1) That the taxpayers filed a partnership return for the year 1963 in which they reported gross receipts of \$26,942, payment to partners-salaries and interest, \$12,836.67; that they indicated on said return that they were engaged in the business of surveying; that they did not file any unincorporated business tax return for said year on the ground that they claimed that unincorporated business tax ms not applicable.

- changes was issued against the taxpayer partnership imposing unincorporated business tax in the amount of \$290.98 with interest of \$24.66 for a total of \$315.64 and accordingly issued a netice of deficiency therefor upon the ground that the activities of the taxpayers as reported on their partnership return constituted the carrying on of an unincorporated business, the income of which was subject to unincorporated business tax.
- (3) That in March 1962 Karl W. Weisenbacher and Merbert Schnepf formed the partnership of Earl W. Weisenbacher & Associates; that the co-partners each camed a 50% interest in said partnership and profits and losses were shared equally; that the partners were engaged in the business of land surveying which was conducted at 7 Montauk Highway, Sayville, New York; that the clients of the partners were primarily developers of commercial buildings, owners of residential dwellings and apartment houses or contract builders; that the partnership prepared surveys, maps and prints; that the partnership employed a part-time secretary and two assistants to help the co-partners in the field to survey areas for their correct determination and description and for conveyancing determining boundaries; that the partners worked as a team; that they performed their own drafting work; that the surveys prepared by the partnership were signed by the licensed partner Earl W. Weisenbacher, with his seal as limensed land surveyor affixed thereto.
 - (4) That in September 1959 Earl W. Weisenbacher was licensed by the New York State Education Department as a land surveyor; that Herbert Schnep? was not licensed by the New York State Department of Education as a land surveyor prior to 1968.
 - (5) That the unlicensed partner held himself out to the public as engaged in the profession of land surveying.

(6) That in June 1966, the New York State Reportment of Education directed that the land surveying partnership of Earl. W. Weisembacher & Associates be discontinued on the ground that the partnership was in violation of the provisions of section 7209 of the Education Law which requires every member of a firm, partnership or joint stock association engaged in the practice of land surveying to be a licensed land surveyor; that the land surveying partnership in accordance therewith was discontinued; that Earl W. Weisembacher continued his individual practice as a licensed land surveyor with Herman Schmapf as his employee.

Rased upon the foregoing findings and all of the evidence presented herein, the State Tax Commission hereby

DECIDES:

- (A) That during the years in issue, the tampayer partnership was not engaged in the practice of the profession of land surveying since it failed to meet the requirements of section 7809 of the Education Lew.
- ongaged in the practice of a profession within the intent and meaning of Section 703(c) of the Tax Law; that the tempeyor partnership was accordingly during the year in issue not empitied to a professional exemption and was during the year in issue, therefore, subject to the unincorporated business tax.
- (C) That, accordingly, the statement of sudit changes and notice of deficiency imposing unincorporated business tax for the year 1963 is correct; that the same does not include any tax or other charge which could not have been lawfully demanded; that the petition of the taxpayers for redetermination

of a deficiency or for refund of unincorporated business tax filed with respect thereto be and the same is hereby denied. DATED: Albany, New York this 8th day of April , 1969.

STATE TAX CONSCIPSION

/s/ JOSEPH H. MURPHY

/s/

A. BRUCE MANLEY

With Vien