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

PHOTO MICROGRAPHICS INC.

MEMORANDUM

TO

State Tax Commission

FROM

Mr. Rook

SUBJECT:

Cancellation of Penalty

Norman Szeremy

I have received a request from the above taxpayer that we cancel the penalty imposed for his failure to file a personal income tax return.

This is a case of residency and domicile which was one of the 40 cases resolved at the last Tax Commission meeting. Originally, the hearing officer had recommended cancellation of the tax.

When the hearing officer rewrote the case, he neglected the penalty question which was academic under the decision as proposed.

Had this penalty question come to my attention, I certainly would have recommended cancellation of the penalty because the failure to file was due to reasonable cause.

Although the Income Tax Bureau has authority to cancel the penalty, this matter was before the Tax Commission and is appropriately referred to it.

I recommend cancellation. If you agree,

kindly endorse this memorandum.

EDWARD ROOK

SECRETARY TO THE

STATE TAX COMMISSION

achment - File

In the Matter of the Petition

of

NORMAN SZEREMY

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) \pm 966 & 1967:

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 6th day of March, 1974, she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon Norman Szeremy,

(representative of) the petitioner in the within

proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows:

Mr. Norman Szeremy

Mr. Norman Szeremy R.D #1 - Box 10113

Portsmouth, Virginia 23703

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

6th day of March , 19 74

Trantha Dunaro

In the Matter of the Petition

of

NORMAN SZEREMY

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 & 1967.:

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 6th day of March, 1974, she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon George C. Shattuck, Esq. (representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows: George C. Shattuck, Esq.

Bond, Schoeneck & King, Esqs. 1000 State Tower Building Syracuse, New York 13202 sed in a postpaid properly addressed wrappe

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

6th day of March

. 19 74

Jorgan Tha Suraso



STATE TAX COMMISSION

STATE OF NEW YORK

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

BUILDING 9, ROOM 214A 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

> Albany, New York March 6, 1974

Mr. Morman Sugremy R.D. #1 - Box 10013 Portemouth, Virginia 23703

Dear Mr. Szeremy:

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

Please take further notice that pursuant to **590** of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced within 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,

State Tex Commission

cc: Petitioner's Representative

Law Bureau

Enc.

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

;

of

NORMAN SZEREMY

DECISION

for Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Personal Income Tax under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the Years 1966 and 1967.

Petitioner, Norman Szeremy, petitioned for a redetermination of a deficiency in personal income taxes under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the years 1966 and 1967.

A formal hearing was held at the offices of the State Tax Commission, State Office Building, Syracuse, New York, on June 29, 1972, before L. Robert Leisner, Hearing Officer. The taxpayer was represented by George C. Shattuck, Esq., and the Income Tax Bureau was represented by Saul Heckelman, Esq., (Alexander Weiss, Esq., of Counsel).

ISSUES

- I. Did petitioner change his domicile to Virginia in October, 1966?
- II. Is petitioner liable for resident New York State taxes for both the entire years of 1966 and 1967?

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner, Norman Szeremy, timely filed New York State resident income tax returns for the year 1966. Petitioner filed no New York return for 1967.

- 2. A Notice of Determination of deficiencies in personal income taxes for the years 1966 and 1967 was issued on February 24, 1970, against the taxpayer under File No. 8-29866011. The deficiency includes a penalty for failure to file a 1967 return.
- 3. The taxpayer petitioned for redetermination of the defi-
- 4. Petitioner is a management level engineer with General Electric. General Electric permanently moved petitioner's department to Virginia in October, 1966 and assigned petitioner to the Virginia location.
- 5. Petitioner attempted to sell or rent his New York home during 1966 and 1967, but was unable to do so. His wife and children (at various times) occupied the house for both 1966 and 1967 to prevent the fire insurance from lapsing.
- 6. Several of petitioners' children attended New York schools and colleges while living in the New York home in 1966 and 1967.
- 7. Petitioner never visited his Syracuse address of his own volition after October, 1966. He stayed there on several short business trips to Syracuse (ordered by General Electric) and once on his doctor's orders.
- 8. Within one month of arriving in Virginia, petitioner rented and maintained an apartment. Petitioner looked for and purchased a home in Virginia.
- 9. On vacations and holidays petitioner's family visited him in Virginia. Petitioner did not visit them in New York.

- 10. Petitioner let his New York car registration and drivers license expire and registered his car in Virginia and obtained a Virginia drivers license. Petitioner did not vote in New York in 1966 or 1967. Petitioner registered to vote in Virginia in 1968.
- 11. Petitioner's wife joined him in Virginia in 1969, when the New York home was rented.
- 12. Petitioner has maintained and occupied a Virginia address up to the time of this hearing on June 29, 1972.
- 13. Petitioner filed a resident Virginia income tax return for 1967.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- A. Petitioner's domicile continued in New York until 1969 when his family moved to Virginia.
- B. In 1966, petitioner maintained a permanent place of abode in New York State for the full year and spent in the aggregate more than 183 days in this state. Under such circumstances, petitioner was a resident pursuant to Tax Law section 605(a)(2).
- C. In 1967, petitioner, a New York domiciliary, spent in the aggregate more than 30 days in New York State. Petitioner was a resident for 1967 pursuant to Tax Law section 605(a)(1).
- D. The petition is denied with respect to 1966 and 1967 and the determination of the deficiencies in income tax are sustained.
- E. Pursuant to the Tax Law, interest shall be added to the total amount due until the date of payment.

DATED: Albany, New York March 6, 1974

STATE TAX COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

Mittim Kvern

COMMISSIONER