JREAU OF LAW A-Z
MEMORANDUM Goldson, Millen H. BUREAU OF LAW

TO:

Commissioners Hurphy, Macduff and Conlon.

FROM:

Francis V. Dow, Mearing Officer

SUBJECT:

In the Matter of the Application of MILTON H. AND HURITL GOLDS For Revision or Refund of Personal Income Taxos Under Article 16 of the Tax Law for the Year 1957

In the Matter of the Application of Phrame The

JOHN AND VINSINIA REMINED?

For Revision or Refund of Personal
Income Taxes Under Article 16 of
the Tax Law for the Year 1957

In the Matter of the Application of
JOHNTH SIPKIND

For Revision or Refund of Personal
Income Taxes Under Article 16 of
The Tax Law for the Year 1957

A hearing with reference to the above natters we hale 9/27/67)

before me at 80 Contro Street, New York, New York on June 21, 1967,
The appearances and the exhibits produced were as shown in the
stonographic minutes submitted hereafth. The tempeyore, June 31, 1967,
Sipkind and John Kannedy were partners, They are Milton II, and
Mariel Coldson, who were not partners, were represented by the Mariel Goldson, who were not partners, were represented by the same attorney. There is a common issue in all of these matters.

The issue involved herein is whether assessments based upon Federal audit changes were timely when they were issued within one year of the filing of notification of Federal changes in not income but isomed more than three years after the date for filing of income tex returns.

The tempeyers, John and Virginia Kammedy, and Joseph and Yetta Sipkind filed copies of changes in income resulting from a Federal audit of their 1957 tex returns with the Department of Taxation and Finance on May 6, 1964 following a request of the Income Tax Bureau that they file a notice of change in their Federal taxable income. On August 17, 1964, a notice of assessment (Assessment No. AB 056102) was issued against the texpayers, John and Virginia Konnedy which assessed additional normal tex and sential mains tax in the assessed additional normal tex and capital gains tex in the amount of \$775.01 based on the Federal changes of their income. Also, on August 17, 1964, a Notice of Assessment (Assessment No. AN 096103) was issued against Joseph and Yetta Sipkind which assessed additional normal tex and capital gains tex in the amount of \$511.18 and which assessment was also based on Federal changes of their income. The taxpayers, Milton M. and Muriel Coldson, filed a copy of changes of Federal income on May 13, 1964 following a request of the Income Tax Bureau that they file such a motice of such change. These changes resulted from a Federal audit of their 1957 tax returns. An assessment was issued on June 34, 1964 based on the Federal changes of taxable income (Assessment No. ANTY 344977) which assessed normal tax and capital gains tax due in the amount of \$614.02.

The texpayors claim that the assessments were not made within the time period prescribed by Section 373 of the Tax Low. They contend that they could not be issued subsequent to three years from the time their New York income tax returns were required to be filed. They contended that Section 373, subdivision (4) of the Tax Law does not allow an assessment of additional tax to be made based on a Federal change in income after the expiration of the three-year period.

In the matter of Louis and San Pargneli, the issue involved herein was considered by the Mate Tax Commission. Its position that the assessments could be issued beyond the three-year statutory period was recently upheld by the Supreme Court, 30 MTCRR 270.27 provides for the issuence of an assessment within one year of the receipt of notification of Federal changes notwithstanding the limitation of the time within which an assessment may otherwise be made.

The case of Maldes v. State Tax Commission, 17 A D 26 47, cited by the texpayers in support of their position, dealt with claims for refund as a result of ver-less deductions for the year 1941. It involved the construction of a statute which extended the time limitation to file an application with regard to war losses for the calendar year 1941 and is not applicable to the issue involved here.

For the reasons stated above, I recommend that the determination of the State Tax Commission denying the taxpayers' applications in the above matters be substantially in the form submitted herewith.

/s/	FRANCIS V. DOW
, ,	BATTLE GTTER

TVD:ac

September 15, 1967

9-15-67

STATE OF HER YORK STATE TAX COMMENSATION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION

الله

MILITON H. AND MINIML GOLDSON

YOR REVISION OR REPORD OF PERSONAL INCOME TAXES UNDER ARTICLE 16 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE YEAR 1997

The tempeyers having filed an application for revision of refund of personal income tem under Article 16 of the Tem Low for the year 1957 and a hearing having been held in connection therewith at the effice of the State Tem Commission, 60 Sentre Street, New York, New York on June 21, 1967 before Francis V. Dow, Mearing Officer of the Department of Temation and Finance, at which hearing the tempeyers were represented and the record having been duly emmined and considered,

The State Tax Commission hereby finds:

- (1) That a Pederal sudit was made of the tampayers' 1997 Federal income tax returns that as a result of the Pederal audit the tempayers' reported temple income as adjusted resulted in an increase in the tempayers' income and capital gains for the year 1997; that the tampayers' normal income was increased by the amount of \$4,100.30 and that their capital gains were increased by the amount of \$9,382.74.
- (2) That on May 13, 1966, the temperors filed a copy of changes in Pederal income with the Department of Temation and Pinance as a result of the Pederal audit of their 1997 income tem return.
- (3) That an accomment was Leaved for 1957 under date of June 24, 1964 (Accomment No. ANNY 344977) according normal

tex and capital gains tex due in the amount of \$61A.02 in conformity with changes unde in their texable income on the culit of the texpayors! Tederal income tex return within one year of the receipt of notification by the texpayor of the Federal change.

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

Shat the assessment issued for the year 1957 (Assessment So. AREF 344977) was timely issued in accordance with Section 373, subdivision (4) of the Tax Imr and SO MFGRR 870.21, since it was issued within one year of the metification by the tempeyor of the Federal change; that, accordingly, the assessment is correct and does not include any tax or other charges which could not have been lawfully demanded and that the texpayors' application for revision or refund in respect thereto be and the same is hereby decied.

DATED: Albany, New York on this 27th day of September , 1967.

STATE TAX CONSTRUCTOR

/s/	JOSEPH H. MURPHY
	100 (33) (33)
/s/	JAMES R. MACDUFF
/ 5/	STATE OF THE STATE
/s/	WALTER MACLYN CONLON
	Control of the second