In the Matter of the Petition

of

Oscar Spruyt

d/b/a Mark 1 Bldg. Mtce. Contractors

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

for Redetermination of a Deficiency or a Revision

of a Determination or a Refund of

Sales & Use Tax

under Article 28 & 29 of the Tax Law

for the Period 8/1/65 - 11/30/75.

State of New York County of Albany

Jay Vredenburg, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 17th day of October, 1980, he served the within notice of Decision by mail upon Oscar Spruyt, d/b/a Mark 1 Bldg. Mtce. Contractors, the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows:

Oscar Spruyt

d/b/a Mark 1 Bldg. Mtce. Contractors

1738 Lippold St.

Merrick, NY 11566

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 petitioner herein and that the address set forth on said wrapper is the last known address of the petitioner.

Sworn to before me this 17th day of October, 1980.

Ketorah ABank

In the Matter of the Petition

of

Oscar Spruyt

d/b/a Mark 1 Bldg. Mtce. Contractors

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

for Redetermination of a Deficiency or a Revision

of a Determination or a Refund of

Sales & Use Tax

under Article 28 & 29 of the Tax Law

for the Period 8/1/65 - 11/30/75.

State of New York County of Albany

Jay Vredenburg, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 17th day of October, 1980, he served the within notice of Decision by mail upon Sheldon Zinman the representative of the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows:

Mr. Sheldon Zinman Zinman & Chetkof 410 Jericho Turnpike Jericho, NY 11753

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. 7

Sworn to before me this 17th day of October, 1980.

Detirch a Bank

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

October 17, 1980

Oscar Spruyt d/b/a Mark 1 Bldg. Mtce. Contractors 1738 Lippold St. Merrick, NY 11566

Dear Mr. Spruyt:

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

You have now exhausted your right of review at the administrative level. Pursuant to section(s) 1138 & 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 4 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:

NYS Dept. Taxation and Finance Deputy Commissioner and Counsel Albany, New York 12227 Phone # (518) 457-6240

Very truly yours,

STATE TAX COMMISSION

cc: Petitioner's Representative Sheldon Zinman Zinman & Chetkof 410 Jericho Turnpike Jericho, NY 11753 Taxing Bureau's Representative STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

OSCAR SPRUYT

d/b/a

MARK I BUILDING MAINTENANCE CONTRACTORS

DECISION

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 August 1, 1965 through November 30, 1975.

Petitioner, Oscar Spruyt, d/b/a Mark I Building Maintenance Contractors, 1738 Lippold Street, Merrick, New York 11566, filed a petition 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 August 1, 1965 through November 30, 1975 (File No. 14386).

A formal hearing was held before Edward L. Johnson, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, Two World Trade Center, New York, New York on May 18, 1978 at 1:15 P.M. and was continued on July 21, 1978 at 9:15 A.M. Petitioner appeared by Zimman & Chetkof, P.C. (Sheldon Zimman, Esq., of counsel). The Audit Division appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq. (James Morris Esq., Patricia L. Brumbaugh, Esq., and Frank Levitt, Esq., of counsel).

ISSUE

Whether the Audit Division properly computed the amount of sales and use taxes due in the absence of adequate records maintained by the taxpayer.

 $\frac{1}{1+\epsilon} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{1}$

tegram de la respecta <mark>al mante de la l</mark>eva de la collègique de la collègique de la collègique de la collègique d Calabora de la collègique Collègique de la collègiq

agi dikebata ke dada kiba ayan gibara a ke wasan kulung

kaintak oleh ingala mengalah mengalah di kabupat Perbagian di Kabupat Perbagian di Kabupat Perbagian di Kabupat

ැය. රායදර්වාද දැමුණ යන වී මත යනු හැකින් දැනම්නේ මුණ වැඩි දැනීම දුනු

ය වෙන්නේ දැන්න විද්යාම්පත්ව ද යන් වන්න ඉහර සහ යට වැන්න වල් පෙනෙනේ වායන දවල් දුණු දුණින්

i karan ikun malikun ilipiping dahiyahan bahasa ya sala di ilipitati karan karan karan karan karan karan karan

a Bernard Bernard and a salah sarah arriba bernardak dalah bagai bernardak bernardak bernardak bernardak berna

of the first of the contract of the first of

graphical plantage of the first of the solution was in the party of the filles of the

and the continuence of the page of the continuence

Part William Conference of Special Conference of the Special Conferenc

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. On March 22, 1976, the Audit Division issued to petitioner a.

 Notice of Determination and Demand for Payment of Sales and Use Taxas Due
 for tax of \$10,023.00 plus penalty and interest of \$6,658.73 for a total of
 \$16,681.73.
- 2. On audit, the Audit Division ascertained the petitioner was not a registered vendor for sales tax purposes, did not file any sales and use tax returns, nor did he charge or collect any sales taxes from his customers or pay over any sales taxes on the services he performed.

Petitioner's former wife filed a Certificate of Conducting Business
Under an Assumed Name in the county clark's office of Nassau County Cn
March 30, 1964 indicating that Grace Spruyt intended doing business as Mark
One Building Maintenance Contractor at 1738 Lippold Street, Merrick, New
York.

3. The auditor spoke with one woman in 1976 who stated that petitioner had washed the windows in her apartment in New York City four or five times a year for several years. He had given her bills for the services rendered. The bills were on the letterhead of Mark I Building Maintenance Contractors (Mark). Some were dated September 18, 1973, February 6, 1974, April 26, 1974, October 22, 1974 and February 18, 1975. The informant told the auditor that petitioner had done the window washing at 3:00 or 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon. She stated that petitioner also serviced several other tenants in the building. The auditor spoke only to the one customer and did not seek the names and addresses of other customers nor did he make any further effort to locate other customers.

in Continue of the Continue of the Miles of the Continue of th

n our fait when little that the male the fait the least and a control of the fait th

esta de la ligação de la como de

The authors we see the without the case the alternative to the control of the case of the

- 4. Petitioner was a union window washer by trade, having been employed by Allied Window Cleaning Company, 2 Penn Plaza, New York City. He submitted a written statement averring that his working hours for Allied were from 6:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, with one Saturday out of four as compulsory overtime.
- 5. Petitioner testified that beginning in 1967, he had sought and obtained window washing jobs on his own both in New York City and in Long Island. Petitioner stated that this private work was done after 3:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and on some Saturdays. With the exception of serving one customer who had her windows washed in the winter, petitioner stated all his window washing was done between April first and June thirtieth, and September first and November thirtieth from 1967 through 1975. Petitioner's customers were all residents in homes or apartments.
- 6. Petitioner produced no books or records of his receipts from his private window washing activities. He testified that it took him about fifteen minutes to complete washing the average window. Some French windows took longer because of the numerous small panes. Some windows with single panes took less time. From 1967 through 1970, petitioner charged one dollar per window; worked an average of four hours per week for twenty-six weeks; and earned \$416.00 per year.

In 1971, petitioner increased his charge per window to \$1.25 and his hours worked to four and a half so that he washed an average of eighteen windows per week. For twenty-six weeks, petitioner computed his earnings in 1971 at \$585.00.

In 1972 and 1973, petitioner averaged six hours per week at his private window washing business for earnings of \$780.00 each year.

e proposition of the state of the second sec

The constitution of the co

if your characters we will also we will also the constant of t

Tours would be stained in the series of the

The 1972 and 1975 and 1975 and the selection of a court of the fallocation of the falloca

In 1974 and 1975, petitioner claimed that his per window charge was increased to \$1.50 and his working time to six and a half hours per week for total weekly earnings of \$39.00. He grossed \$1,014.00 in each of these years.

- 7. Petitioner's son, Mark Spruyt, occasionally helped his father in the window washing business from August 1972 to August 1975. Then he testified that he helped his father four or five times a year. In 1967 and 1968, Mark Spruyt was in high school and worked once or twice each year. From 1969 to 1972, he was away from home attending college. He stated that petitioner did all the billing and collecting for window washing.
- 8. The auditor testified that in the absence of any records from petitioner, he was compelled to estimate petitioner's sales receipts. The auditor based the assessment on the assumption that with two people performing window cleaning services (Mr. Spruyt and his son) it was feasibly possible to do \$300.00 a week worth of business. The auditor did not know how long it took to wash a window, nor did he know how much the charge was for washing a window. There was no objective data available nor solicited as to the number of hours the petitioner worked. The sales tax due was computed on the estimated \$300.00 per week.
- 9. Petitioner claimed that he had not known his charges for window washing were subject to sales tax until he was notified that sales tax was due. He admitted that his union did not permit its members to engage in private window washing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. That section 1138(a) of the Tax Law states that if a return required to be filed is not filed or if incorrectly or insufficiently filed, the amount of tax due shall be determined from such information as may be available.

If necessary, the tax may be estimated on the basis of external indices, such as stock on hand, purchases, rental paid, number of rooms, location, scale of rents or charges or other factors. The estimate in this case, however, was arbitrary and the tax was not properly determined under section 1138(a) of the Tax Law.

B. That based upon the evidence adduced in Finding of Fact "6" the tax due is to be recomputed based on the gross sales as follows (to be apportioned by quarters):

1967	\$416.00	1972	.\$ 780.00
	416.00	1973	
	416.00	1974	
	416.00	.1975	
1071			

C. That the petition of Oscar Spruyt d/b/a Mark I Building Maintenance Contractors is granted to the extent indicated in Conclusion of Law "B" above. The Audit Division is hereby directed to modify the Notice of Determination and Demand for Payment of Sales and Use Taxes Due issued March 22, 1976; except as so granted, the petition is in all other respects denied.

DATED: Albany, New York

OCT 1 7 1980

STATE TAX COMMISSION

OMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

and the Control of th

and the property for the following descent protection of the configuration of

nation in a transfer to the contraction of the cont

la marita e di juliur anchi il arizati il izizio parti per la republica di perdire.

in the state of the first of the state of th

and the contraction of the contr

် လုပ်လုပ္ပံုး ကား နေလည်း လည်းလုပ် ကျော်များကျည့် နေလည်း ကားသည် စပညာစေ သစ်သွား လည်းပြုံပြုပြုသည်။

OCT 1 7 1980