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

PHOTO MICROGRAPHICS INC.

L 9 (12-67)

IREAU OF LAW A-Z
MEMORANDUM Roche, Reta Sh. BUREAU OF LAW

TO:

The State Tax Commission

FROM:

Alfred Rubinstein, Hearing Officer

SUBJECT:

Application of Rite M. Rocks for Devision or Refund of Personal Income Taxos under Article 22 of the Tex Lew for the Year 1961

Putition of Rita M. Rocke for Redetermination of a Deficiency or for hefund of Personal Income Taxon under Article 22 of the Tax Lew for the Year 1962

A joint hearing on the above entitled application and petition was held before me at the effice of the State Tax Spinniggion, 80 Centre Street, How York, How York, on Hovember 14, 1967. The appearances and exhibits were as noted on the transcript.

The issues involved displlowence of claimed deductions for (1) "transportation expenses" between texpayor's home and her effice, and (2) "spall office expenses" for contributions for gifts to follow employees and expense of office parties.

Taxpayer, a resident of North Bergen, Nov Jersey, was employed by Standard Cil Company of New Jersey, at 30 heatefular Flama, New York City. She filed nonresident income tax returns for 1961 and 1962, reporting total New York income of \$6,469.81 for 1961 and \$6,739.30 for 1962. In computing total New York income she deducted "transportation expenses" of \$371.00 for each year. "Transportation expenses" consisted of the cost of travel between her home and her office. In addition, the tax-payer included in her New York Itamized defections claimed "mall office expenses" in the amount of \$180.00 for 1961 and \$186.60 for 1962. "Small office expenses" consisted of her contributions for gifts to follow employees and expense of office parties.

The Income Tax Durosu disallowed the deductions for transportation and office expenses taken on the 1961 return, on the ground that the items were personal, computed total New York income at \$8,000.51, computed New York Itemized deductions at \$976.18, and adjusted her refund, accordingly, from \$95.53 as elaimed on the return, to \$27.48, by undated voucher (7110 No. 1-5876445). For 1962 only the deduction of \$371.00 for transportation was disallowed as personal (the deduction of \$126.00 for effice expense was allowed for 1962), total New York income computed at \$9,110,20 and her refund for such year, accordingly, adjusted from \$97.40 as claimed on the return, to \$75.94, by vencher dated August 20, 1953 (File No. 2-7113180).

Taxpayor filed timely application for refund for 1961 on September 24, 1962 and timely demand for a hearing on Depumber 2, 1962 after demial of her application on Depumber 24, 1962. Taxpayor filed a timely claim for refund for 1962 on September 10, 1963 and timely potition for refund on Pobrumy 3, 1965 after demial of her claim on December 7, 1964. Taxpayor contended that her deductions were allowable under saction 632 of the Tax law and under the Internal Revenue Gode, and that the Treasury Department had not disallowed them.

Taxpayer did not appear in person at the hearing and no sworn testimeny or exhibits were affered by her representative who declined an offer of adjournment in order to permit her to testify. Taxpayer's attorney did not raise any issue as to the disallowance of claimed office expense, and agreed that the sale issue involved the transportation expense defections.

Although the deduction for small office expense was allowed for 1962 and is not in issue for that year, it should be noted that deductions for contributions for gifts to fullow exployees and expense of office parties are not allowable under the Internal Revenus Gode or the Tax Low and disallowance of such deductions as personal expense for the year 1961 was proper.

Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Gade allows deduction for expenses ordinary and necessary in carrying on a trade or business. Section 212 of the Internal Revenue Gade allows deduction for expenses ordinary and necessary for production or collection of income. Section 615(4)(3) of the Bax law (applicable to nonresidents pursuant to the provisions of section 635(4)(1) allows deductions for expenses ordinary and necessary for the production or collection of income subject to taxation under Article 22.

Glaimed deductions for contributions for gifts to fellow employees and for parties have been held improper and disallemented of such deductions sustained, Holen v. G.E.E., Mby V. Sd 188, J. J. Gom, 11 TON 600, Dec. 17,007(N) G. E. Respell, 11 TON 189, No. 18,090(N), J. R. Richmand, 65-1 unit 7503.

Commutation expense is specifically excluded as defectable by an employee under Pederal Income Tex Regulation 1,68-1(g); specifically excluded as deductable as a business expense under Poderal Income Tax Regulation 1.152-2(%); specifically excluded as deductible under Regulation 20 NTGER 253.2(?); and disallousnes of such deductions has been consistently held to be proper, Steinhort v. C.Z.R., 335 P. 24 496, Tidwell v. C.Z.R., 298 P. 24 496, And other cases too numerous to CIVA.

Accordingly, I am of the opinion that the Income Tax Dureau properly disallowed taxpayer's deductions for claimed transportation expenses and office expenses, and that taxpayer's application and potition should both be demied.

The determination and the decision of the Tax demnission should be substantially in the forms submitted herowith.

/s/ ALFRED RUBINSTEIN

AR:jum Enc. March 1, 1968

3-5-68

STATE TAX CONSTRAINS

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION

65

REPORT AL MOURE

POR REVIEWOR OR REPURD OF PERSONAL INCOME TAXES UNDER ARTICLE 92 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE THAN 1951

Rite M. Rocke having filed an application for revision or refund of personal income tense under Article MR of the Tex law for the year 1961, and a hearing having been held before Alfred Bublinstein, Mearing Officer of the Department of Taxotica and Pineace, at 80 Centre Street, New York, New York, on Mercuber 1A, 1967 at which hearing the tempaper appeared by counsel, Cabriel T. Top, Not., and the matter having been duly enumined and considered.

The State Tax Commission hereby finder

----

- (1) That in 1961 the taxpayer was a resident of the State of New Jersey and employed in New York by Standard 661 Sempony of New Jersey; that for 1961 the taxpayer filed a personal income tax nonresident return reporting total New York income of \$6,449.63; that for 1961 the taxpayer reported New York itemized deductions of \$1,162.18; that on her return the taxpayer claimed a refund of \$36.53 as everypowent of income taxon withhold.
- (2) That by income tax refund voucher (File No. 1-9876465) the Income Tax Bureau computed the taxpayer's 1961 total Now York income at \$8,800.81 by disclicusmos of the deduction therefrom in the sum of \$371.00 claimed as transportation expenses; that the Income Tax Bureau recomputed the taxpayer's Now York itemized deductions at \$976.18 by disclicusmos of a deduction in the sum of \$186.00 claimed as office expenses; that the Income Tax Bureau, accordingly, computed

a not overpayment of taxpayer's income taxes in the sum of \$27.48.

- (3) That the sum of \$371.00 deducted by the taxpayer in computing her 1961 tetal New York income and claimed as transportation expense was her cost of traveling between her hame and her regular place of employment; that the sum of \$186.00 included by the taxpayer in her New York itemized deductions represented contributions by her for gifts to fellow employees and expense of office parties.
- (4) That the tempeyer filed a timely application for refund on September 24, 1962; that tempeyer's application was demied on Nevember 20, 1962; that tempeyer filed a timely demand for hearing on December 2, 1962.

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

## DESCRIPTION:

- (A) That transportation expense incurred by the texpaper in the sum of \$371.00 in 1961 was commutation expense; that the deduction taken by the texpaper from her total New York income for such transportation expense was not an allowable deduction within the meaning of section 632 or section 635 of the Tax Low, and was properly disallowed; that texpaper's total New York income for 1961 was \$8,800.81.
- (3) That effice expense incurred by the tempayer in the sum of \$186.00 in 1961 was not ther ordinary nor necessary in the production of her income, nor directly connected to her occupation; that such deduction was not allowable under section 632 or section 635 of the Tax Lew and was properly disallowed; that tempayer's total New York itemized deductions for 1961 were in the total hum of \$976.18.
- (C) That, accordingly, the tempeyer's everysyment of income temes withheld for 1961 was properly computed at \$27.48, and that

tempoyer's application for refund in excess thereof be and the name is hereby denied.

DATED: Albery, New York this 25th day of March , 1968.

/s/	JOSEPH H. MURPHY
	A SECTION AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE PA
/s/	A. BRUCE MANLEY
7 -7	CONTRACTOR
	•
, ,	
/s/	SAMUEL E. LEPLER

STATE OF HEM YORK

STATE TAX CONSTRUCTOR

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION

MITA M. MOGHE

POR REDUTEMENATION OF A DEFICIENCY OR FOR REPUBLICATION OF A DEFICIENCY TAXES UNDER ARTICLE TO OF THE TAX LAY FOR THE YEAR 1962

Atta M. Roche, having filed a petition for redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of personal income taxos unfor Article 22 of the Tax Law for the year 1962, and a hearing having been held before Alfred Rubinstein, Hearing Officer of the Department of Taxotion and Finance, at 80 Centre Street, Her York, Her York, on Hovember 14, 1967 at which hearing the taxograph peared by counsel, Cabriel 7. Pap, Heq., and the matter having been duly exemined and considered,

The State Tax Commission hereby finds:

- (1) That in 1962 the tempayer was a resident of the State of New Jersey and employed in New York by Standard Cil Company of New Jersey; that for 1962 the tempayer filed a personal income tem nonresident return reporting total New York income of \$6,739.20; that on her return the tempayer claimed a refund of \$97.40 as everyownt of income temps withheld.
- (2) That by income tax refund voucher dated August 20, 1963 (File No. 2-7113180) the Income Tax Dureau computed the taxpayer's 1962 total New York income at \$9,110.20 by disallowance of the deduction therefrom in the sum of \$371.00 claimed as transportation expenses; that the Income Tax Bureau, accordingly, computed a not everynament of income taxos withhold of \$76.94.

- (3) That the sum of \$371.00 deducted by the tampayor in computing her 1962 total New York income and claimed as transportation expense was her cost of traveling between her home and her regular place of employment.
- (4) That the tempoyer filed a timely claim for refund on September 10, 1963; that tempoyer's claim was dealed on December 7, 1964; that tempoyer filed a timely potition for redetermination or refund on February 5, 1965.

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

## DECIDES:

- (A) That transportation expanse insured by the templer in the sum of \$371.00 in 1962 was commutation expanse; that the deduction taken by the tempeyer from her total New York income for such transportation expanse was not allowable under section 632 or section 635 of the Tax Low, and was properly disallowed; that tempeyer's total New York income for 1962 was \$9,110.80.
- (3) That, accordingly, the temperer's everyopment of income taxes withheld for 1962 was properly computed at \$78.94, and that temperer's petition for refund in emoces thereof be and the same is hereby dealed.

DATED: Albeny, New York this 25th day of March , 1968.

/s/	JOSEPH H. MURPHY	
, ,		
/s/	A. BRUCE MANLEY	
/s/	SAMUEL E. LEPLER	