In the Matter of the Petition

of

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

WILLIAM J. BLOOMER
For ax Revision of a Determination or a Refund
of Sales and Use
Taxes under Article(s) 28 & 29 of the
Tax Law for the xxxxx(xx) or Period(xx)
January 1, 1970 through May 31, 1975.

State of New York County of Albany

John Huhn , being duly sworn, deposes and says that spie is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 29th day of September , 1977, she served the within Notice of Determination by (correctives) mail upon William J. Bloomer

(representative xxxxx) the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows: Mr. William J. Bloomer

Box 5
Mahopac, New York 10541

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.

Sworn to before me this

29th day of September , 19 7

John Huhn

TA-3 (2/76)

In the Matter of the Petition

 \circ f

WILLIAM J. BLOOMER

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 29th day of September , 1977, whe served the within Notice of Determination by (certified) mail upon Wolf Magalnick, 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: Wolf Magalnick, C.P.A.

Wolf Magalnick, C.P.A. Old Stone Building P. O. Box C

Mahopac, New York 10541 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

29th day of September , 1977

snet mack

John Huhn

TA-3 (2/76)



JAMES H. TULLY JR., PRESIDENT
MILTON KOERNER
THOMAS H. LYNCH

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

September 29, 1977

Mr. William J. Bloomer Box 5 Mahopae, New York 10541

Dear Mr. Bloomer:

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

You have now exhausted your right of review at the administrative level. Pursuant to section(s) 1138 a 1243 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 A 1241 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 Application

of

WILLIAM J. BLOOMER

DETERMINATION

for Revision of a Determination or for Refund of Sales and Use Taxes under Articles 28 and 29 of the Tax Law for the Period January 1, 1970 through May 31, 1975.

Applicant, William J. Bloomer, Box 5, Mahopac, New York 10541, filed an application for revision of a determination or for refund of sales and use taxes under Articles 28 and 29 of the Tax Law for the period January 1, 1970 through May 31, 1975 (File No. 11219).

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 May 23, 1977 at 1:15 P.M. Applicant appeared by Wolf Magalnick, CPA. The Sales Tax Bureau appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq. (Lawrence Stevens, Esq., of counsel).

ISSUE

Whether the audit of applicant's books and records for the period January 1, 1970 through May 31, 1975 properly reflected applicant's sales and use tax liability.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. During the period January 1, 1970 through May 31, 1975, applicant was a painting contractor who performed the majority of his work for building contractors. He operated under the conception that the contracts he performed were capital improvements to real property. Therefore, he did not collect sales tax or file New York State sales and use tax returns. He paid sales tax on all purchases of materials and supplies.
- 2. The Sales Tax Bureau performed an audit of applicant's books and records for the period January 1, 1970 through May 31, 1975.

 As a result of said audit, it issued a Notice of Determination and Demand for Payment of Sales and Use Taxes Due against applicant on November 6, 1975 in the amount of \$1,517.06, plus penalty and interest.
- 3. Applicant computed gross sales on the basis of total bank deposits. Since at the time of the audit applicant could not prove that the receipts from a \$1,225.00 contract were included in total bank deposits, the Sales Tax Bureau concluded that applicant failed to record all his sales. Therefore, it increased his sales per books (total bank deposits) by 25 percent. The Bureau also analyzed applicant's sales invoices for the first half of 1975 and concluded that 74.2364 percent of applicant's sales were capital improvements and that the remaining sales were taxable transactions.

4. Applicant presented a bank statement as evidence that the receipts from the aforesaid contract for \$1,225.00 were, in fact, deposited and that his sales per books (total bank deposits) were not understated. He presented no documentary evidence to disprove the result of the Sales Tax Bureau's analysis of taxable and exempt sales.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- A. That the applicant presented substantial documentary evidence to show that the gross sales as reported on his books and records were correct and that the Sales Tax Bureau's 25 percent increase of gross sales was not warranted.
- B. That the Sales Tax Bureau's analysis of taxable sales was supported by substantial documentation and, therefore, the resultant findings with respect to this analysis are correct.
- C. That the application of William J. Bloomer is granted to the extent of reducing the gross sales to conform with the gross sales as reported on the applicant's books and records; that the Sales Tax Bureau is hereby directed to accordingly modify the Notice of Determination and Demand for Payment of Sales and Use Taxes

Due, issued November 6, 1975; and that, except as so granted, the application is in all other respects denied.

DATED: Albany, New York

STATE TAX COMMISSION

September 29, 1977

PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER