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

PHOTO MICROGRAPHICS INC.

L 9 (2-67)

Income Tax Determinations

BUREAU OF LAW MEMORANDUM

AW A-Z

Mc Elannon, Raymond J.

Commissioners Murphy. Macduff and Conlon

TO:

FROM:

Vincent P. Molineaux, Hearing Officer

SUBJECT:

In the Matter of the Application of

McElhannon, Raymond J. for Revision or Refund of Personal Income Tax under Article 16 of the

Tax Law for the Year 1959

The taxpayer, Raymond J. McElhannon, is an attorney residing in the State of Connecticut who conducts the practice of law with a firm at 225 Broadway, New York City.

The questions at issue are the disallowance of claims for contributions of \$1,400, professional, entertainment and nonreimbursable travel expenses of \$4,000 from the amount of \$9,400 claimed, and allocation of \$16,920.18 as income earned outside of the State.

The file was referred to the New York office for informal conference, and the taxpayer failed to appear on three scheduled dates without explanation.

The case was scheduled for formal hearing. Taxpayer failed to appear. Telephone attempts to communicate went unanswered, and taxpayer failed to reply to a letter stating that if no response was received within 30 days, waiver of hearing would be assumed.

With respect to the contributions and professional, entertainment and travel expenses, no substantiation was offered.

With respect to the claimed allocation of \$16,920.18, taxpayer submitted diary sheets showing days worked in Columbus, Ohio in the course of which he claims to have rented office space including conference rooms and rooms for stemographic help. He also claims to have spent considerable time in Europe on other litigation requiring office space and help. Taxpayer did not claim to be admitted to the bar in either Chio or England or to carry on a regular practice in either of those places.

Taxpayer's income as disclosed by his return was a distributive share of income of the partnership with its office in New York. For taxpayer to claim allocation it would be

necessary, which he has not done, to show allocation of the partnership income based upon maintenance by the partnership of a regular place or places for the practice of law outside of the State which is not indicated anywhere in the record.

Purthermore, it has been held that a nonresident licensed to practice law in New York and engaged in the practice of law in New York City may not apportion income derived from practice before Federal courts and commissions outside of the State. Services outside are incident to the practice he maintained in New York. Garrenter v. Charman, (1950), 276 A.D. 634, leave to appeal depled 277 A.D. 933.

Based upon the foregoing, I recommend that the determination of the Tax Commission in this matter, affirming the denial of the application for revision, be substantially in the form submitted herewith.

/s/	VINCENT P. MOLINEAUX
/ 9/	VINOLNI F. MOLINEAUX

July 25, 1967 VPM: bdg Enc. OK AN

1-27-67

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION

RATIONS J. MORLHAMMAN

POR MEVISION OR REPURD OF PERSONAL INCOME TAX WEDER ANTIGUR 16 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE YEAR 1959

The tempeyer, Reymond J. McElhannon, having filed an application for revision or refund of personal income tex for the year 1959 and a hearing having been echeduled thereon at the effice of the State Tax Commission, 60 Centre Street, New York, New York, for the second day of March 1967, and no appearance having been made on behalf of the taxpayer, and the documents on file having been duly examined and considered,

The State Tex Commission bereby finds:

- (1) That the temperer is a resident of Connecticut and is engaged in the practice of law as a member of a firm located at \$25 Brandway, New York City.
- (2) That the tempayer paid an estimated tem of \$4,000 for the year 1959 and filed a nearesident return of income which should tem due of \$2,684.14 and claimed a refund of \$1,175.86.
- (3) That on January 3, 1962 the State Tax Commission issued Assessment No. 3 827695 for the year 1959 in the amount of \$1,056.16 based upon disallowance of contributions claimed in the amount of \$1,400 as unsubstantiated, disallowance of \$4,000 of \$9,400 claimed as professional and travel expense, as empensive.
- (4) That also disallowed was temperer's claim for allocation of income of \$16,980.18 outside of New York for the year 1939 as based upon schedules showing days worked in New York, 201 and days worked outside of New York, 69 and supported by photocopies of disay pages for 1959 displaying days spent in Columbus, this and in England on

litigation in the course of which the temperer was required to rent office space including conference rooms and rooms for etenographic help.

- (5) Impayor did not claim to have been admitted to practice law in Ohio or in England.
- (6) That a hearing was echeduled for Harch 2, 1967 at 1:30 p.m. at 50 Centre Street, New York, New York and tampayer was duly notified thereof.
- (7) The temperer failed to appear at said hearing or to present evidence or arguments to support the application for revision.

Insed upon the foregoing findings and all of the evidence in the file, the State Tax Countesian hereby

AND DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY.

- (A) That the claims for professional and entertainment expenses in the amount of \$4,000 and contributions of \$1,400 were properly disallowed as unsubstantiated and an exemption of \$3,600 was properly credited.
- (3) That the claim for allocation of income outside of New York was present disallowed.
 - (C) That Assessment No. 3 827695 was correctly issued.
- (3) That the denial of the application for revision is affirmed.

AND IT IS SO CERTAIN

Dated: Albany, New York this 9th day of August , 1967.

/s/	JOSEPH H. MURPHY
/s/	JAMES R. MACDUFF
/s/	WALTER MACLYN CONLON