



STATE OF NEW YORK  
DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

STATE TAX COMMISSION  
Mario A. Procaccino  
~~JOHN J. XXXX~~, PRESIDENT

A. BRUCE MANLEY  
MILTON KOERNER

BUILDING 9, ROOM 214A  
STATE CAMPUS  
ALBANY, N. Y. 12227

AREA CODE 518  
457-2655, 6, 7

STATE TAX COMMISSION  
HEARING UNIT

EDWARD ROOK  
SECRETARY TO  
COMMISSION

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

Dated: Albany, New York

May 8, 1974

Mr. Ivan Chermayeff  
c/o Brownjohn & Chermayeff  
59 East 54th Street  
New York, New York

Dear Mr. Chermayeff:

Please take notice of the **DETERMINATION** of  
the State Tax Commission enclosed herewith.

Please take further notice that pursuant to section 386j of  
the Tax Law any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision  
must be commenced within **90 Days** after  
the date of this notice.

Any inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed  
in accordance with this decision or concerning any other matter relat-  
ing hereto may be addressed to the undersigned. These will be referred  
to the proper party for reply.


Very truly yours,

L. Robert Leisner  
HEARING OFFICER

cc Petitioner's Representative  
Law Bureau


**STATE OF NEW YORK**  
**Department of Taxation and Finance**

STATE CAMPUS  
ALBANY, N. Y. 12227



Mr. Ivan Chermayeff  
c/o Brownjohn & Chermayeff  
59 East 54th Street  
New York, New York

Art.  
L. Baker & Leonard  
D. J. W. G.





—F.D.R. STATION—

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

---

In the Matter of the Application :

of :

ROBERT BROWNJOHN and IVAN CHERMAYEFF :  
Individually and as copartners d/b/u :  
the firm name and style of: :

BROWNJOHN & CHERMAYEFF :

for Revision or Refund of Unincorporated. :  
Business Taxes under Article 16-A of the :  
Tax Law for the Period May 1, 1957 to :  
August 1, 1957. :

---

---

In the Matter of the Application :

of :

IVAN CHERMAYEFF and THOMAS GEISMAR :  
Individually and as copartners d/b/u :  
the firm name and style of: :

DETERMINATION

CHERMAYEFF & GEISMAR ASSOCIATES :

for Revision or Refund of Unincorporated :  
Business Taxes under Article 16-A of the :  
Tax Law for the Period July 1, 1960 to :  
December 31, 1960. :

---

---

In the Matter of the Application :

of :

ROBERT BROWNJOHN, IVAN CHERMAYEFF :  
and THOMAS GEISMAR, Individually :  
and as copartners d/b/u the firm :  
name and style of: :

BROWNJOHN, CHERMAYEFF & GEISMAR :

for Revision or Refund of Unincorporated :  
Business Taxes under Article 16-A of the :  
Tax Law for the Years 1957 (Period August 1, :  
1957 to December 31, 1957) and 1959. :

---

Applicants, Brownjohn and Chermayeff, Chermayeff and Geismar Associates, and Brownjohn, Chermayeff and Geismar, applied for a redetermination of deficiencies in unincorporated business taxes under Article 16-A of the Tax Law for the period May 1, 1957 to August 1, 1957, July 1, 1960 to December 31, 1960, August 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, and for the year 1959.

A formal hearing was held at the offices of the State Tax Commission, 80 Centre Street, New York, New York, on October 14, 1964, and continued on February 2, 1965, before Solomon Sies, Esq., Hearing Officer. The taxpayers were represented by Arthur M. Dubow, Esq.

#### ISSUE

Were the three partnerships practicing a profession and therefore exempt from paying unincorporated business pursuant to Article 16-A, section 386 of the Tax Law?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Applicants, Brownjohn and Chermayeff, Chermayeff and Geismar Associates, and Brownjohn, Chermayeff and Geismar timely filed New York State unincorporated business tax returns for the periods May 1, 1957 to August 1, 1957, July 1, 1960 to December 31, 1960, August 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, and for the year 1959.

2. A Notice of Additional Assessment in unincorporated business taxes for the periods May 1, 1957 to August 1, 1957, July 1, 1960 to December 31, 1960, August 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, and for the year 1959 was issued on December 7, 1961, and March 20, 1962, against the taxpayers under File No. B992042.

3. The taxpayers applied for redetermination of the deficiencies.

4. More than eighty percent of the gross income of the partnerships was derived from the personal services actually rendered by the members of the partnership and capital was not a material income producing factor.

5. The taxpayers were educated in the field of design at various schools including Harvard University, Yale School of Fine Arts, the Institute of Design of the Illinois Institute of Technology, Brown University and the Rhode Island School of Design.

6. The Industrial Designers Society of America has defined industrial design as an ability to deal with all the physical aspects and properties of a company whereby public goodwill is influenced visually, including the design of trademarks, packaging, interiors of offices and administration buildings, company signs and trucks, public exhibits and even stationery, office forms and uniforms of employees.

7. Taxpayers, Chermayeff and Geismar (Brownjohn has been living in England since 1960) were both senior members of the Industrial Designers Society of America in 1965. A senior member is a classification requiring ten years of practice in the profession of industrial design. The society therefore recognized taxpayers, Chermayeff and Geismar, as having been industrial designers for at least the ten years up until 1965.

8. The taxpayers' work for the periods in question included the design of corporate symbols, architectural lettering, exhibit design, design of uniforms, design of products (i.e. a new aerosol can top) and many other examples of industrial design included within the above definition of the Industrial Designers Society of America.


CONCLUSIONS OF LAW


A. We hold that the taxpayers are engaged in the practice of the profession of industrial design. Teague v. Graves, et al., 261 App. Div. 652, 287 N.Y. 549. The taxpayers met well defined criteria for this profession and the profession of industrial design has been held to be exempt from the unincorporated business tax in Teague v. Graves.


B. The taxpayers' petition is sustained. It is determined that there are no additional assessments or deficiencies in unincorporated business tax against the taxpayers for the periods in question.

DATED: Albany, New York  
May 8, 1974

STATE TAX COMMISSION

  
COMMISSIONER

  
COMMISSIONER

  
COMMISSIONER