

POOR
QUALITY
THE FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT (S)
ARE
FADED & BLURRED

PHOTO MICROGRAPHICS INC.

BUREAU OF LAW

MEMORANDUM

Income Tax Determinations

A-2

Steiner, Grace

TO:

Commissioner Murphy and MacCall

FROM:

Francis V. Dow, Hearing Officer

SUBJECT:

Grace Steiner, application for
revision or refund of an assessment
of personal income taxes for the
years 1937 and 1939

A hearing with reference to the above matter was held before me at 20 Canton Street, New York, New York, on October 4, 1965. The appearances and the evidence produced were as shown in the stenographic minutes and exhibits submitted herewith.

The issue involved is whether payments received by the taxpayer under a separation agreement are taxable to her.

The taxpayer entered into a separation agreement on March 10, 1940 which provided for payments for the support and maintenance of her and a child of the marriage. The agreement did not fix any part of the payments as a sum payable for the support of the child only. An assessment was issued against the taxpayer for the year 1937 on the ground that the taxpayer failed to report the amount of \$4,700.00 received by her under the separation agreement during that year and assessed tax, penalty and interest in the sum of \$114.50 (Assessment No. 2-370005). An assessment (Assessment No. 2-370071) was issued for the year 1939 on the basis that the taxpayer received \$4,000.00 under the separation agreement during 1939 which she also failed to report, and assessed tax, penalty and interest in the sum of \$114.32.

The taxpayer contends that the amendment to section 205 subdivision 2 of the Tax Law effective April 2, 1946 providing that periodic payments received by a wife under a separation agreement are includable in her gross income, does not have retroactive effect so as to apply to agreements entered into before the effective date. She further contends that such a construction would result in an impairment of a contractual obligation and that (1) it would, unjust and undue an undue hardship to shift the tax burden on the payments from her husband to her.

Chapter 300 of the Laws of 1936 was the department bill which amended section 205 subdivision 2 of the Tax Law. It substantially confirmed New York law to the Federal law although section 71 of the

Internal Revenue Code limited itself to payments made under separation agreement executed after August 14, 1954. Prior to the enactment of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, only payments under a separation agreement incidental to a divorce or separation decree were includible in the wife's gross income under Federal law.

The 1955 amendment to section 159 subdivision 3 of the Tax Law was made applicable to returns commencing on or after January 1, 1955. It was explained by 20 USTC ¶13,414 (1955). The law requires the inclusion in the gross income of the wife of periodic payments received by her in any taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 1955. Neither the law nor the regulation excludes payments under separation agreements executed prior to January 1, 1955.

The Legislature did not exceed its power. Judge Lehman in *People ex rel. Louis A. De V. Gurnea, 203 N.Y. 434*, stated, "The rule is that no limitation upon the legislative power to impose a tax excludes the power to give retroactive effect to a tax law. Thus, only a retroactive application of a tax law which would result in the taking of property arbitrarily is beyond the power of any Legislature."

The taxpayer's contention that section 159 subdivision 3 is unconstitutional because it imposes a contractual obligation is not sustainable. A stipulation in the contract cannot prevail over the power of a state's taxing power or prescribe who shall be under a duty to the state to pay it nor fix the time and mode of payment even though the parties to the contract as to who, as between themselves, shall ultimately bear the tax. This has been repeatedly held by the U.S. Supreme Court in respect to the contracts and their subordination to the taxing power of the States (see *Harmon v. Shannon, 37 Supreme Court 70, 200 U.S. 21, 26 L. ed. 25*).

For the reasons stated above, I recommend that this determination of the Tax Commission in this matter be substantially in the form submitted herewith.

/s/

FRANCIS V. DOW

~~RECEIVED~~

FVD:lb

Enc.

December 21, 1966

(Dec. 1, 1966)

/s/

MARTIN SCHAPIRO

~~APPROVED~~

/s/

S. HECKELMAN

~~APPROVED~~

STATE OF NEW YORK
STATE TAX COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION

OF

GRACE STOKES

**FOR REVISION OR REFUND OF FEDERAL INCOME
TAXES UNDER ARTICLE 16 OF THE TAX LAW FOR
THE YEARS 1937 AND 1939**

The taxpayer herein having duly filed applications for revision or refund of personal income taxes imposed under Article 16 of the Tax Law for the years 1937 and 1939, and a hearing having been held in connection therewith at the office of the State Tax Commission at 26 Centre Street, New York, New York, before Francis V. Fox, Hearing Officer, at which hearing the taxpayer was represented by counsel, and the record having been duly examined and considered,

The State Tax Commission hereby finds:

(1) That the taxpayer, Grace Stokes, a resident of the State of New York, entered into a separation agreement with her husband on March 19, 1940 which provided for the support and maintenance of her and a child of the marriage who was then eleven years of age and did not file any part of the payments as a tax payable for the support of the child only; that pursuant to the separation agreement the taxpayer received \$4,700.00 in 1937 and \$4,000.00 during the year 1939; that the taxpayer did not file a New York income tax return for 1937 or 1939; that the taxpayer had no other income during those years.

(2) That Chapter 300 of the Laws of 1936 enacted April 2, 1936 amended Section 109(c) of the Tax Law to require the wife to include in her gross income periodic payments received by her in any taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 1936.

(3) That an assessment (Assessment No. 2 970883) was issued for the year 1937 on the ground that the taxpayer failed to report the amount of \$4,700.00 received by her during the year under the separation agreement and assessed tax penalty and interest in the sum of \$112.50; that an assessment was issued on January 12, 1938 for the year 1939 amounting \$114.32 (Assessment No. 2 970871) which included penalty and interest based on the taxpayer's failure to file a return for that year.

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

DETERMINES:

(A) That the payments received by the taxpayer during 1937 and 1939 under the separation agreement are reportable as income by her during each year even though the agreement was executed prior to the enactment of Section 87(2) making such payments taxable to the wife.

(B) That the assessments for additional taxes (Assessment Nos. 2 970883 and 2 970871) for the years 1937 and 1939 are additional and that such assessments are correct and lawfully due and owing, together with interest and other statutory charges, and do not include any other taxes or charges which are not lawfully due and owing.

DATED: Albany, New York, the 6th day of December, 1941.

STATE TAX COMMISSION

/s/

JOSEPH H. MURPHY

/s/

JAMES R. MACDUFF