In the Matter of the Petition

of

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

THE SHAFFORD COMPANY

State of New York County of Albany

Bruce Batchelor , being duly sworn, deposes and says that

whe is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of

age, and that on the 26 day of April , 19 77, whe served the within

Notice of Decision by (certified) mail upon The Shafford Company

(THE THE SHEET COPY THE PETITIONER IN the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows: The Shafford Company 12-01 44th Street

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.

Long Island City, NY 11101

Sworn to before me this

26 day of April , 1977.

Buch Batchelos

TA-3 (2/76)

In the Matter of the Petition

of

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

THE SHAFFORD COMPANY

For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or a Revision of a Determination or a Refund of Unincorporated Business Taxes under Article(s) 23 of the Tax Law for the Year(s) oxy Period(9) 1965. 1966.

State of New York County of Albany

Bruce Batchelor , being duly sworn, deposes and says that whe is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 26 day of April , 1977, Whe served the within

Notice of Decision by (certified) mail upon Joseph Weill, CPA

(representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding,

by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed

Joseph Weill, CPA as follows:

Siegel & Weill

635 Madison Avenue

New York, New York 10022 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 of the) petitioner herein and that the address set forth on said wrapper is the last known address of the (representative of the) petitioner.

Sworn to before me this

. 1977. 26 day of

enet mek

Bruce Betchelis



STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

TAX APPEALS BUREAU

STATE CAMPUS ALBANY, N.Y. 12227

April 26, 1977

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

TELEPHONE: (518) 457-1723

The Shafford Company 12-01 44th Street Long Island City, MY 11101

Gentlemen:

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

Please take further notice that pursuant to of the Tax Law, any 722 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. They will be referred to the proper party for reply.

Very truly yours,

Supervisor of

Petitioner's Representative: Bearings

Joseph Weill, CPA Siegel & Weill

635 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022 Taxing Bureau's Representative:

Enc.

cc:

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

THE SHAFFORD COMPANY

DECISION

for a Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Unincorporated Business Taxes under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the Fiscal Years Ending January 31, 1965, January 31, 1966 and January 31, 1967.

Petitioner, The Shafford Company, 12-01 44th Street, Long Island City, New York 11101, has filed a petition for a redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of unincorporated business taxes under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the fiscal years ending January 31, 1965, January 31, 1966 and January 31, 1967.

On July 15, 1976 petitioner, The Shafford Company, advised the State Tax Commission in writing that they waived a small claims hearing and requested that the State Tax Commission decide the case upon the entire record contained in the file.

ISSUES

I. Whether petitioner, The Shafford Company, was entitled to an allowance for partners' services, for those partners who were trusts.

II. Can the trustee, being actively engaged in the conduct of business, be allowed a deduction for partners' services?

FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. That the trust for the benefit of James D.

 Hartman and the trust for the benefit of Dana L. Hartman

 (Fryer) were not actively engaged in the unincorporated

 business, nor did they, or could they, render personal

 services for the business. That therefore, no allowance

 for partners' services may be claimed in accordance with

 the meaning and intent of section 708(a) of the Tax Law.
- 2. That the trustees, Henrietta L. Hartman,
 Nathanial P. Kann and George P. Slesinger were not partners
 of The Shafford Company and; therefore, said company may
 not claim a deduction on its unincorporated business tax
 return, for an allowance for partners' services for the
 services rendered by the trustees.

3. That the petition of The Shafford Company is denied, and the Notice of Deficiency dated April 11, 1969 in the amount of \$1,977.27 is sustained.

DATED: Albany, New York
April 26, 1977

STATE TAX COMMISSION

PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONED