In the Matter of the Petition

of

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

PAUL E. and MARY ANGELA DOHERTY

For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or a Revision of a Determination or a Refund of Personal Income

Taxes under Article(%) 22 of the

State of New York County of Albany

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.

okn Huh

Sworn to before me this

24th day of January

19 79.

TA-3 (2/76)

In the Matter of the Petition

of

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

State of New York County of Albany

John Huhn , being duly sworn, deposes and says that whe is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 24th day of January , 1979 , whe served the within Notice of Decision by (certified) mail upon Martin Rubashkin

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

Martin Rubashkin c/o Whitman & Ransom 522 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10036

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) 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 January . 1979.

Marly Tapeneau



STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COMMISSION TAX APPEALS BUREAU ALBANY, NEW YORK 12227

January 24, 1979

Paul E. and Mary Angela Doherty 458 Wavesink River Road Red Bank, NJ 07701

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Doherty:

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

You have now exhausted your right of review at the administrative level. Pursuant to section 690 of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision by the State Tax Commission can only be instituted under Article 78 of the Civil Practice Laws and Rules, and must be commenced in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Albany County, within **four months** from the date of this notice.

Inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision may be addressed to the Deputy Commissioner and Counsel to the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, Albany, New York 12227. Said inquiries will be referred to the proper authority for reply.

Sincerely,

Joseph Chyrywaty Hearing Examiner

cc: Petitioner's Representative

Taxing Bureau's Representative

### STATE OF NEW YORK

### STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petitions

of

PAUL E. and MARY ANGELA DOHERTY

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

DECISION

Petitioners, Paul E. and Mary Angela Doherty, 458 Navesink River Road, Red Bank, New Jersey 07701, filed petitions for redetermination of deficiencies or for refund of personal income tax under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the years 1966 (for Paul E. Doherty) and 1967 (for Paul E. and Mary Angela Doherty). (File No. 01067)

A small claims hearing was held before Joseph A. Milack, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, Two World Trade Center, New York, New York, on January 24, 1977 at 10:45 A.M. Petitioners appeared by Martin Rubashkin, Esq. The Income Tax Bureau appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq. (Abraham Schwartz, Esq., of counsel).

## ISSUE

Whether petitioner Paul E. Doherty, a resident of New Jersey, properly allocated his income to sources within and without New York State for 1966 and 1967.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. New York State nonresident returns were filed by petitioner Paul E.

  Doherty for 1966 and by Paul E. and Mary Angela Doherty for 1967. On said returns,
  a portion of the partnership income reported for Federal purposes was reported as

  New York source income.
- 2. On October 28, 1968, the Income Tax Bureau issued a Notice of Deficiency to Paul E. Doherty for 1966. On July 27, 1970, it issued a Notice of Deficiency for 1967. Both notices were issued on the grounds that a partnership distribution made to Paul E. Doherty in each of the aforementioned years was income from New York State sources.
- 3. During 1966 and 1967, petitioner Paul E. Doherty, a resident of New Jersey, was a partner in the law firm of Lowenstein, Pitcher, Hotchkiss & Parr (hereinafter "the partnership"), which maintained its only office in New York, New York. He was the only member of the partnership who was licensed to practice law in New Jersey.
- 4. The partnership was not authorized to practice law in New Jersey during 1966 and 1967, nor was it authorized to maintain an office in said state. During said years, petitioner maintained an office in his own name in Jersey City, New Jersey. Said office was maintained at the expense of the partnership.
- 5. During 1966 and 1967, petitioner Paul E. Doherty earned fees through his New Jersey office. Said fees were exclusively earned by him from the practice of law in New Jersey.
- 6. The aforesaid fees were deposited by petitioner in his personal bank account and reported to the partnership. The partnership did not receive the fees; however, it included them in its gross receipts and reported them as part of the partnership distribution made to Paul E. Doherty for the years at issue.

- 7. The partnership reported all of its income as being derived from New York sources (including the fees in question) for 1966 and 1967, on its New York State partnership returns filed for said years.
- 8. Section 1:21-6(d)(1) of the Rules of Court of New Jersey precluded a distribution of fees earned by petitioner in New Jersey to his law partnership in New York.
- 9. Petitioner reported the fees he earned through his New Jersey office on his New York State income tax nonresident returns filed for the years 1966 and 1967, as being derived from sources without New York State.

# CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- A. That the partnership distribution made to petitioner Paul E. Doherty by Lowenstein, Pitcher, Hotchkiss & Parr for 1966 and 1967 constitutes income from New York State sources, pursuant to section 637(a)(1) of the Tax Law; that petitioner Paul E. Doherty is required to report all income received from Lowenstein, Pitcher, Hotchkiss & Parr as New York source income, within the meaning and intent of 637(b)(2) of the Tax Law and 20 NYCRR 134.2.
- B. That the petition of Paul E. Doherty for 1966 and the petition of Paul E. Doherty and Mary Angela Doherty for 1967 is denied and the notices of deficiency issued October 28, 1968 and July 27, 1970 are sustained.

DATED: Albany, New York January 24, 1979

STATE TAX COMMISSION

RESIDENT

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONED