

State of Georgia

Department of Revenue

Frank Al. O'Connell Director

Administrative Division — Office of Tax Policy 1800 Century Blvd., Suite 15311 Atlanta, Georgia 30345-3205 (404) 417-6649





Dountas T. AlacGinnitie

Commissioner

Re: An Intangible Recording Tax Protest and Claim for Refund per O.C.G.A. § 48-6-76(c) in the amount of the appropriate upon recording a security instrument representing a refinance with the Clerk of Superior Court, the amount of December 4, 2012. Parties are (Grantor) and Clerk of Superior Court, Grantee)

Dear

I have carefully considered your Protest and Claim for Refund of intangible recording tax per O.C.G.A. § 48-6-76(c) pursuant to the above-captioned matter. Your Protest and Claim for Refund plus all accompanying documents were considered in the review. It is my determination that your Claim for Refund in the amount of **Constant** is denied. The amount may not be refunded.

O.C.G.A. § 48-6-65 Extension, transfer, assignment, modification, or renewal of instrument; exemption for amount of note refinanced, at (b), provides that, "No tax shall be collected on that part of the face amount of a new instrument securing a long-term note secured by real estate which represents a refinancing by the original lender of unpaid principal on a previous instrument securing a long-term note secured by real estate *if*: "*at* (2)(A), "The new instrument contains a statement of what part of its face amount represents a refinancing of unpaid principal on the previous instrument;" or (B), "The holder of the new instrument submits an affidavit as to what part of the face amount of the new instrument represents a refinancing of unpaid principal on the previous instrument," (emphasis added)

Ga. Comp. R. & Regs. r. 560-11-8-.05 <u>Refinancing</u>, at (1), holds that intangible recording tax is



not required to be paid on the face amount of a new instrument securing a long-term note secured by real estate which *represents a refinancing by the original lender and original borrower* of unpaid principal of an existing instrument securing a long-term note secured by real estate, still owned by the original lender, if the intangible recording tax was paid on the original instrument or the original holder of the instrument was exempt. At (a): The new instrument must contain a statement of what part of the face amount represents a refinancing of unpaid principal. This information *must be disclosed on the face of the instrument or in the alternative may be submitted in the form of an affidavit indicating which part of the face amount represents a refinancing of unpaid principal.* (emphasis added)

When a named party to an original instrument, either the Grantor or Grantee, transfers or assigns their rights to another party, an exemption of the outstanding principal balance of the loan from intangible recording tax may not be granted, even if the original party later reacquires those rights. In the instant matter, the Grantor as captioned on the original instrument

separate one-half interest into individual revocable living trusts via a Quitclaim Deed recorded on February 25, 2005 [Contemported on October 11, 2012]

At that time, each Trust conveyed their respective one-half interest to alone, the Grantor as captioned on a long-term security instrument recorded under Protest on December 4, 2012.

A determination as to whether intangible recording tax is due, and the proper amount of tax due, is made at the time of recording based on the information and documentation provided to the Clerk of Superior Court. In the instant matter, the security instrument recorded under Protest on December 4, 2012, meets the definition of a security instrument under the *Code*. In contravention of both the statute and regulation, you failed to disclose on its face for the benefit of the collecting officer a statement that it related to any prior security instrument on file in

Nor was any statement given for the benefit of the collecting officer that indicated what the existing principal balance of the prior loan was as it relates to the instrument being recorded. In the alternative, you also failed to submit an affidavit per § 48-6-65(b)(2)(B) and 560-11-8-.05(a).

Accordingly, the security instrument presented for recording, with a stated long-term amount of principal advanced to the Borrower totaling the state was subject to collection of the strument intangible recording tax. The Clerk of Superior Court recorded the instrument timely and collected the proper amount of tax due. The Protest and Claim for Refund must be denied.

A copy of this determination is being provided to the Clerk of Superior Court, the source of that the money collected and deposited into an escrow account per O.C.G.A. § 48-6-76(b) may be distributed according to law.

Please be advised that any taxpayer whose Protest and Claim for Refund is denied, in whole or in part, has the right to bring an action for refund of the amount so claimed and not approved against the collecting officer who received the payment and recorded the instrument. The action may be filed in either the Superior Court of the county in which the instrument was recorded or



in the Georgia Tax Tribunal no later than 60 days from the date of the denial, and served pursuant to law.

Sincerely,

Frack M. Rocall

Frank M. O'Connell

FOC/RJL/me

cc: Clerk of Superior Court,

· -.

÷ - '