**AFFIDAVIT** 

JAMES 6. VERNER LSBIBTANT ATTORNET GENERAL

WILLIAM F. AUSTIN

MRS. SADYE B. DAVIS



## STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 6

· COLUMBIA'E 3

August 15, 1958

JAMES M. WINDHAM
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENS
COUNSEL
TAX COMMISSION

IRVING F. BELBER ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL GENERAL COUNSEL PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

INCERTAIN L. JOHNSON ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL COUNSEL WILLIAM H. GIBBES

OPINION FILE

David S. Mellichamp, Esquire Lawyers Abstract Company 1316 Washington Street Columbia, South Carolina

> Re: Section 65-688 Code of Laws South Carolina, 1952, tax stamps on leases

Dear Mr. Mellichamp:

Your letter of August 1, 1958, to the Attorney General has been handed to the writer for attention and reply.

You called to our attention a hesitancy on the part of certain Clerks of Court in recording leases without the South Carolina documentary stamps where such leases are wholly executed outside of South Carolina and payments under which are made outside of this State.

Under circumstances such as above indicated, it has been the position of the South Carolina Tax Commission not to require the placement of stamps thereon which position, we think, is correct under the two leading decisions dealing with documentary stamps, namely, Graniteville Manufacturing Company v. Query, 44 F. (2d) 64 and South Carolina Electric and Gas Company v. Pinckney, 60 S. E. (2d) 851.

Leases have been considered taxable as obligations to pay money which is under Section 65-688 with which, of course, the above mentioned decisions dealt.

To restate the matter, if a lease is wholly executed outside of the State of South Carolina, it is our opinion that such lease, under those circumstances, may be recorded without South Carolina documentary stamps being affixed thereto.

James M. Windham Assistant Attorney General SOUTH CAROLINA TAX COMMISSION

JMW/br

Lawyers Abstract Co.