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

PHOTO MICROGRAPHICS INC.

In the Matter of the Petition

of

DODWORTH POMERHN & MARGARET POMERHN

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) 22 Tax Law for the (Year(s) 1966 through: 1968

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 10th day of July , 19 73 she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon Dodworth & Margaret Pomerhn (representative of) the petitioner in the within

proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid

wrapper addressed as follows: Dodworth & Margaret Pomerhn

Lake Shore Road West

Lake Tamarak

Stockholm, New Jersey 07460

and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a (post office or official depository) under the exclusive care and custedy 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

10th day of , 1973, The Turaso

In the Matter of the Petition

of

DODWORTH POMERHN & MARGARET POMERHN

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) 22 of the Tax Law for the (Year(s) 1966 through: 1968

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 10th day of July , 1973, she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon Harry Savin, C.P.A.

(representative of) the petitioner in the within

proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid

wrapper addressed as follows: Harry Savin, C.P.A.

60 East 42nd Street

Suite 1533

New York, New York 10017

and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a (post office or official depository) under the exclusive care and custedy 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

10th day of July , 1973.

Jon the Tunase



STATE OF NEW YORK

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

BUILDING 9, ROOM 214A STATE CAMPUS

ALBANY, N. Y. 12227

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

> EDWARD ROOK SECRETARY TO COMMISSION

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

NORMAN F. GALLMAN, PRESIDENT

A. BRUCE MANLEY
MILTON KOERNER

STATE TAX COMMISSION

Albany, New York

July 10, 1973

Dodworth & Margaret Pemerhn Lake Shore Road West Lake Temarak Stockholm, New Jersey 07460

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Pomerha:

Please take notice of the

decision

of

the State Tax Commission enclosed herewith.

Please take further notice that pursuant to the Tax Law any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced within after 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 relating hereto may be addressed to the undersigned. These will be referred to the proper party for reply.

Very truly yours,

Migel G. Wright

night Wight

HEARING OFFICER

cc Petitioner's Representative
Law Bureau

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petitions

of

DODWORTH POMERHN and MARGARET POMERHN:

DECISION

for a Redetermination of a Deficiency or for refund of Personal Income Taxes under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the Years 1966 through 1968.

Dodworth Pomerhn and Margaret Pomerhn, his wife, each filed petitions for the redetermination of separate deficiencies issued against them for personal income taxes under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the years 1966 through 1968.

A hearing was duly held on February 7, 1973, before Nigel G. Wright, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, 80 Centre Street, New York, New York.

The petitioners were represented by Harry Savin, C.P.A. The Income Tax Bureau was represented by Saul Heckelman, Esq., appearing by James Scott, Esq.

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

ISSUE

The issue in this case is whether salary received for work performed at petitioners' New Jersey home is allocable outside of New York.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioners were both employees of Pomerhn Studios, Inc. Mr. Pomerhn is a specialized type of commercial artist. His wife is a bookkeeper. The corporation withholds both income tax and social security taxes from their salaries.

- 2. The petitioners are the sole stockholders of Pomerhn Studios, Inc.
- 3. The corporation's office is at 141 East 44th Street,
 New York City. This is a single room of about 10 by 13 feet.
 It contains two desks, an artist's work space, shelves, and books.
 The corporation had no other office for purposes of corporation taxes, unemployment insurance or any other purpose.
- 4. Petitioners are residents of New Jersey listing their address at Lake Shore Road West, Lake Tamarak, Stockholm, New Jersey. Petitioner, Dodworth Pomerhn, maintains there is a room where he can perform his work. A telephone there had the same number as the corporation's New York office.
- 5. Petitioners filed combined income tax returns for 1966, 1967 and 1968. For 1966, the salaries of both of petitioners were allocated to New York by the fraction of 113 over 226 (one-half). For 1967, the salary of Mr. Pomerhn was allocated to New York by the fraction 117 over 234 (one-half) and the salary of Mrs. Pomerhn was allocated by the fraction 25 over 225 (one-ninth). For 1968, the salary of Mr. Pomerhn was allocated by the fraction 120 over 258 and the salary of Mrs. Pomerhn by the fraction 30 over 236.
- 6. Schedules submitted at the hearing by the petitioners showing the days allegedly worked outside the state for 1967 were consistent with the 1967 return. Similar schedules for 1968 showed 188 days for Mr. Pomerhn instead of the 138 days shown on the 1968 return and further showed 213 days for Mrs. Pomerhn instead of the 200 days shown on the return. No schedules were submitted for 1966. For none of the years was any diary or other original records produced.

- 7. The petitioners were not present at the hearing.
- 8. The deficiency notices for 1966 were issued on April 11, 1969, for 1967 on July 28, 1969, and for 1968 on August 30, 1971. The deficiencies with interest computed to the date of the notices are as follows:

	1966	<u>1967</u>	1968
Dodworth Pomerhn	\$1,865.00 222.74	\$2,077.50 160.24	\$2,424.51 <u>345.40</u>
	\$2,087.74	\$2,237.74	\$2,769.91
Margaret Pomerhn	\$ 377.50 <u>45.08</u>	\$ 555.83 <u>42.87</u>	\$ 759.56 108.21
	422.58	598.70	867.77

DECISION

The petitioners have not carried the burden of proof that the work performed at home should be allowed for purposes of allocating income away from New York (see <u>Burke v. Bragalini</u>, 10 AD 2d 654).

The deficiency is found to be correct and due together with additional interest as computed under section 684 of the Tax Law.

DATED: Albany, New York

July 10, 1973

STATE TAX COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER