In the Matter of the Petition

of

EDNA HATTEN

For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or a Refund of Personal Income
Taxes under Article(s) 16 of the
Tax Law for the (Year(s)1960

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING OF NOTICE OF DECISION BY (CERTIFIED) MAIL

State of New York County of Albany

MARTHA FUNARO , being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 24th day of October , 19 73, she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon EDNA HATTEN

(representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid

wrapper addressed as follows:

Miss Edna Hatten 386 Genesee Street Buffalo, New York

and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a (post office or official depository) under the exclusive care and custody of the United States Post Office Department within the State of New York.

That deponent further says that the said addressee is the (representative of) petitioner herein and that the address set forth on said wrapper is the last known address of the (representative of the) petitioner.

Sworn to before me this

4th day of

7 mar 1973

traithe Survey

In the Matter of the Petition

of

EDNA HATTEN

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING OF NOTICE OF DECISION BY (CERTIFIED) MAIL

For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or a Refund of Personal Income
Taxes under Article(s) 16 of the
Tax Law for the (Year(s) 1960

State of New York County of Albany

MARTHA FUNARO, , being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 24th day of October, 19 73, she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon WILLIAM H.

WEBER, JR., ESQ. (representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows:

William H. Weber, Jr., Esq. 1300 Genesee Building Buffalo, New York 14202

and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a (post office or official depository) under the exclusive care and custody of the United States Post Office Department within the State of New York.

That deponent further says that the said addressee is the (representative of) petitioner herein and that the address set forth on said wrapper is the last known address of the (representative of the) petitioner.

Sworn to before me this

24th day of October, 19

Grantha Duraso



STATE TAX COMMISSION

# STATE OF NEW YORK

# DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

STATE CAMPUS
ALBANY, N. Y. 12226

AREA CODE 518 457-2655, 6, 7 STATE TAX COMMISSION HEARING UNIT

EDWARD ROOK
SECRETARY TO
COMMISSION

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

A. BRUCE MANLEY
MILTON KOERNER

DATED: Albany, New York
October 24, 1973

Miss Edna Hatten 386 Genesee Street Buffalo, New York

#### Dear Miss Batten:

Please take notice of the DETERMINATION of the State Tax Commission enclosed herewith.

Please take further notice that pursuant to Section(s) 375 of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced within 90 days from the date of this notice.

Any inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision or concerning any other matter relative hereto may be addressed to the undersigned. These will be referred to the proper party for reply.

Very truly yours,

mys & Whigh

Higel G. Wright HEARING OFFICER

Enc.

cc: Petitioner's Representative

Law Bureau

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application

of

**L** 

EDNA HATTEN

**DETERMINATION** 

for Revision or Refund of Personal Income Taxes under Article 16 of the Tax Law for the Year 1960.

Edna Hatten filed an application under section 374 of the Tax Law for revision of personal income taxes under Article 16 of the Tax Law for the year 1960. The aforementioned application was denied. A hearing was demanded and duly held on September 20, 1965, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, 65 Court Street, Buffalo, New York, before Vincent P. Molineaux, Hearing Officer. The applicant, Edna Hatten, was not present at the hearing but was represented by William H. Weber, Jr., Esq.

The record of this hearing has been duly examined and considered.

#### **ISSUES**

The issues are whether (1) the Income Tax Bureau was properly estimated applicant, Edna Hatten's income for the year 1960 and (2) whether the Income Tax Bureau properly assessed applicant, Edna Hatten, a 100% penalty for fraud with intent to evade payment of taxes for 1960.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Applicant, Edna Hatten, was arrested on a narcotics

charge on April 8, 1962. At the time of her arrest she had in her possession \$1,224.20 in cash which was seized by the police. On April 10, 1962, the Special Investigations Bureau of the Income Tax Bureau issued a Notice of Additional Assessment #B-S.I.B. 11668 in order to attach the aforesaid funds. These funds were obtained from the police plus an additional \$595.12 and were applied in partial payment of the aforementioned assessment. This assessment was based upon estimated taxable income for 1960 amounting to \$28,400.00. The estimate was made pursuant to section 373 of the Tax Law. The assessment amounted to \$6,207.04 which included \$2,771.00 for additional taxes, \$2,771.00 as a 100% penalty and interest of \$665.04.

- 2. Although applicant, Edna Hatten, claims she was a "housewife" she was apparently unmarried and she failed to provide sufficiently detailed evidence to show that she had a source of nontaxable income or savings to account for even minimal living expenses.
- 3. The Income Tax Bureau has failed to submit documentary or other evidence to prove that applicant, Edna Hatten, was guilty of fraud with intent to evade the payment of taxes.

# CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- A. The Income Tax Bureau's estimate of applicant,

  Edna Hatten's taxable income for the year 1960 was correct.
- B. The Income Tax Bureau did not properly assess applicant, Edna Hatten, a 100% penalty for fraud since they failed to meet the burden of proof by presenting documentary or other sufficient evidence to support its contention.

# DETERMINATION

The application of Edna Hatten is granted to the extent that the 100% penalty for fraud is eliminated. In all other respects, the application is denied.

DATED: Albany, New York October 24, 1973 STATE TAX COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

#### STATE OF NEW YORK

# DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

STATE TAX COMMISSION

Mario A. Procaccino

Mario A. Procaccino

Mario A. Procaccino

A. BRUCE MANLEY
MILTON KOERNER

STATE CAMPUS
ALBANY, N. Y. 12226

AREA CODE 518 457-2655, 6, 7 STATE TAX COMMISSION THEARING UNIT

EDWARD ROOK SECRETARY TO COMMISSION

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

fb the

DATED: Albany, New York October 24, 1973

Miss Edna Hatten 386 Genesee Street Buffalo, New York

Dear Miss Hatten:

Please take notice of the DETERMINATION of the State Tax Commission enclosed herewith.

Please take further notice that pursuant to Section(s) 375 of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced within 90 days from the date of this notice.

Any inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision or concerning any other matter relative hereto may be addressed to the undersigned. These will be referred to the proper party for reply.

Very truly yours,

Nigel G. Wright HEARING OFFICER

c: Petitioner's Representative Law Bureau

Enc.

386 Genesee Street Buffalo, New York Miss Edna Hatten ROUTE NO --B 312 57 V 3 RAZEO - ... JINGLAIMED -NO SUCH NUMBER X STREET REFUSED ---- VACANT. GOVED, NOT FOUNDABLE ---MOVEN, LEFT NO ANDRESS ---NO WALL RECEPTACLE. TEMPORACIUM AUM ----ADORRESSEE URSSOWN OUT OF BUSINESS. Department of Taxation and Finance STATE OF NEW YORK ALBANY, N. Y. 12227

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application

of

EDNA HATTEN

DETERMINATION

for Revision or Refund of Personal Income Taxes under Article 16 of the Tax Law for the Year 1960.

Edna Hatten filed an application under section 374 of the Tax Law for revision of personal income taxes under Article 16 of the Tax Law for the year 1960. The aforementioned application was denied. A hearing was demanded and duly held on September 20, 1965, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, 65 Court Street, Buffalo, New York, before Vincent P. Molineaux, Hearing Officer. The applicant, Edna Hatten, was not present at the hearing but was represented by William H. Weber, Jr., Esq.

The record of this hearing has been duly examined and considered.

#### ISSUES

The issues are whether (1) the Income Tax Bureau was properly estimated applicant, Edna Hatten's income for the year 1960 and (2) whether the Income Tax Bureau properly assessed applicant, Edna Hatten, a 100% penalty for fraud with intent to evade payment of taxes for 1960.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Applicant, Edna Hatten, was arrested on a narcotics

charge on April 8, 1962. At the time of her arrest she had in her possession \$1,224.20 in cash which was seized by the police. On April 10, 1962, the Special Investigations Bureau of the Income Tax Bureau issued a Notice of Additional Assessment #B-S.I.B. 11668 in order to attach the aforesaid funds. These funds were obtained from the police plus an additional \$595.12 and were applied in partial payment of the aforementioned assessment. This assessment was based upon estimated taxable income for 1960 amounting to \$28,400.00. The estimate was made pursuant to section 373 of the Tax Law. The assessment amounted to \$6,207.04 which included \$2,771.00 for additional taxes, \$2,771.00 as a 100% penalty and interest of \$665.04.

- 2. Although applicant, Edna Hatten, claims she was a "housewife" she was apparently unmarried and she failed to provide sufficiently detailed evidence to show that she had a source of nontaxable income or savings to account for even minimal living expenses.
- 3. The Income Tax Bureau has failed to submit documentary or other evidence to prove that applicant, Edna Hatten, was guilty of fraud with intent to evade the payment of taxes.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- A. The Income Tax Bureau's estimate of applicant,

  Edna Hatten's taxable income for the year 1960 was correct.
- B. The Income Tax Bureau did not properly assess applicant, Edna Hatten, a 100% penalty for fraud since they failed to meet the burden of proof by presenting documentary or other sufficient evidence to support its contention.

# DETERMINATION

The application of Edna Hatten is granted to the extent that the 100% penalty for fraud is eliminated. In all other respects, the application is denied.

DATED: Albany, New York October 24, 1973 STATE TAX COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER