In the Matter of the Petition

οf

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

State of New York County of Albany

muce Batchelor , being duly sworn, deposes and says that the is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 4th day of March , 19 77, whe served the within Notice of Decision by (certified) mail upon Charles R., Jr. & Isabel K. Bechtle (representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows:

Mr. & Mrs. Charles R. Bechtle, Jr. 26 Strawberry Hill Avenue Stamford, Connecticut 06902

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 Postal Service within the State of New York.

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

Sworn to before me this

4th day of March

. 1977.

Bruce Batchelor



# STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

TAX APPEALS BUREAU

STATE CAMPUS ALBANY, N.Y. 12227 ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

March 4. 1977

TELEPHONE: (518) 457-1723

Mr. & Mrs. Charles R. Bechtle, Jr. 26 Strawberry Hill Avenue Stamford, Connecticut 06902

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Bechtle:

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

Please take further notice that pursuant to Section(%) 690 of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced within 4 months from the date of this notice.

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. They will be referred to the proper party for reply.

Very truly yours,

Frank J. Puccia Supervisor of Small

Claims Hearings

CC: MOETRIONEN YOURSEN ROBENTRIONE:

Taxing Bureau's Representative:

Enc.

#### STATE OF NEW YORK

#### STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

CHARLES R., JR. & ISABEL K. BECHTLE:

DECISION

for Redetermination of a Deficiency or : for Refund of Personal Income Taxes under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the : Year 1972.

Petitioners, Charles R., Jr. and Isabel K. Bechtle, residing at 26 Strawberry Hill Avenue, Stamford, Connecticut 06902, have filed a petition for redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of personal income tax under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the year 1972. (File No. 2-23198619).

A small claims hearing was held before Joseph Marcus, Hearing Officer, on August 17, 1976, at 1:15 P.M. at the offices of the State Tax Commission, Two World Trade Center, New York, New York. The petitioner appeared pro se and for her husband, petitioner Charles R. Bechtle, Jr. The Income Tax Bureau appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq., (Irwin A. Levy, Esq., of counsel).

#### ISSUE

Were days worked at home by petitioner Charles R. Bechtle, Jr., during the year 1972, allocable as days worked within or days worked without New York State?

## FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Petitioners, Charles R., Jr. and Isabel K. Bechtle, timely filed a New York State income tax return for nonresidents (Form IT-203) for the year 1972. Petitioner, Charles R. Bechtle, Jr., was employed by a New York firm and resided in Philadelphia and Connecticut in the year in question. Petitioner allocated his income in part, based on days worked at home. On April 14, 1975, the Income Tax Bureau issued a Statement of Audit Changes, disallowing part of the time petitioner claimed he worked out of New York State. In accordance with the aforesaid Statement, a Notice of Deficiency was issued on August 25, 1975 in the amount of \$1,102.26, including accrued interest.
- 2. Petitioner, Charles R. Bechtle, Jr., conceded the changes made by the Income Tax Bureau with the exception of 16 days. It was contended that by arrangement with his employer, petitioner was permitted to work at home so that he could be with his children. Several years ago the petitioner obtained custody of his children.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. That the days worked at home during the year 1972 by petitioner, Charles R. Bechtle, Jr., were worked there by reason of his necessity and convenience and not for the necessity of his employer; and therefore, for purposes of allocation of salary income, said days must be held to be days worked within New York State in accordance with the meaning and intent of section 632(c) of the Tax Law and 20 NYCRR 131.16.

B. That the petition of Charles R., Jr. and Isabel K. Bechtle is denied and the Notice of Deficiency issued August 25, 1975, is sustained.

DATED: Albany, New York March 4, 1977

STATE TAX COMMISSION

.

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER