

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

October 5, 1984

Allison Ayres, Inc.  
c/o New York Credit Adjustment Bureau  
71 West 23rd St.  
New York, NY 10001

Gentlemen:

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 of the Tax Law, a proceeding in court to review an adverse decision by the State Tax Commission may be instituted only under Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law 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  
Law Bureau - Litigation Unit  
Building #9, State Campus  
Albany, New York 12227  
Phone # (518) 457-2070

Very truly yours,

STATE TAX COMMISSION

cc: Petitioner's Representative  
Eileen Blake  
Hahn & Hessen  
350 Fifth Ave.  
New York, NY 10118  
Taxing Bureau's Representative

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

---

In the Matter of the Petition :  
of :  
Allison Ayres, Inc. : AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING  
for Redetermination of a Deficiency or Revision :  
of a Determination or Refund of Sales & Use Tax :  
under Article 28 & 29 of the Tax Law for the :  
Period 6/1/76-8/31/80. :

---

State of New York }  
County of Albany } ss.:

David Parchuck, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is an employee of the State Tax Commission, that he is over 18 years of age, and that on the 5th day of October, 1984, he served the within notice of Decision by certified mail upon Eileen Blake, the representative of the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows:

Eileen Blake  
Hahn & Hessen  
350 Fifth Ave.  
New York, NY 10118

and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a post office 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  
5th day of October, 1984.

David Parchuck

James A. Haggard  
Authorized to administer oaths  
pursuant to Tax Law section 174

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

---

In the Matter of the Petition :  
of :  
Allison Ayres, Inc. : AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING  
for Redetermination of a Deficiency or Revision :  
of a Determination or Refund of Sales & Use Tax :  
under Article 28 & 29 of the Tax Law for the :  
Period 6/1/76-8/31/80. :

---

State of New York }  
ss.:  
County of Albany }

David Parchuck, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is an employee of the State Tax Commission, that he is over 18 years of age, and that on the 5th day of October, 1984, he served the within notice of Decision by certified mail upon Allison Ayres, Inc. the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows:

Allison Ayres, Inc.  
c/o New York Credit Adjustment Bureau  
71 West 23rd St.  
New York, NY 10001

and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a post office 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  
5th day of October, 1984.

David Parchuck

James P. Hannon  
Authorized to administer oaths  
pursuant to Tax Law section 174

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

---

In the Matter of the Petition	:	
of	:	
ALLISON AYRES, INC.	:	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 June 1, 1976	:	
through August 31, 1980.	:	

---

Petitioner, Allison Ayres, Inc., c/o New York Credit Adjustment Bureau, 71 West 23rd Street, New York, New York 10001, 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 June 1, 1976 through August 31, 1980 (File No. 33458).

A formal hearing was held before Doris E. Steinhardt, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, Two World Trade Center, New York, New York, on March 20, 1984 at 9:30 A.M. Petitioner appeared by Hahn & Hessen, Esqs. (William R. Fabrizio, Esq. and Eileen Blake, Esq., of counsel). The Audit Division appeared by John P. Dugan, Esq. (Lawrence A. Newman, Esq., of counsel).

#### ISSUE

Whether the Audit Division properly disallowed petitioner's claimed nontaxable sales for petitioner's failure to produce documentation establishing that such sales were for resale.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. For approximately 22 years, petitioner, Allison Ayres, Inc., was engaged in the manufacture of dresses for sale to retailers. Its approximately

4,000 customers ranged from Bloomingdale's and I. Magnin to small boutiques. Petitioner's principal offices were situated at 1400 Broadway, New York, New York. Its other facilities consisted of a shipping department located at 214 West 39th Street, New York City; a cutting room at 234 West 39th Street, New York City; and regional showrooms scattered throughout the United States.

2. For the quarter ended August 31, 1976 through the quarter ended May 31, 1980, petitioner filed sales and use tax returns, reporting gross and taxable sales in the amounts shown below.

<u>PERIOD ENDED</u>	<u>GROSS SALES</u>	<u>TAXABLE SALES</u>
8/31/76	\$4,088,631	\$ 5,887
11/30/76	4,734,874	10,690
2/28/77	2,318,682	3,688
5/31/77	3,245,717	8,263
8/31/77	3,040,335	4,997
11/30/77	3,553,420	6,521
2/28/78	2,418,181	1,823
5/31/78	3,036,958	3,888
8/31/78	3,753,394	3,606
11/30/78	4,383,348	4,707
2/28/79	3,037,727	4,984
5/31/79	3,100,245	11,814
8/31/79	2,346,478	4,866
11/30/79	2,810,174	4,351
2/29/80	1,619,583	2,016
5/31/80	1,239,100	1,834

(The record does not reveal whether petitioner failed to file a return for the period ended August 31, 1980, or whether a return was filed but is now unavailable.)

3. Commencing October, 1979, the Audit Division conducted an examination of petitioner's books and records in order to verify taxable sales as reported. Petitioner's accountant, Mr. Arthur Gordon of the firm Kalow & Bass, orally agreed to the Audit Division's use of the test period method.

(a) The sales tax examiner reviewed in detail petitioner's "computer-generated" sales for the quarter ended November 30, 1978. Sales within this category were to major department stores, made on regular credit terms and

processed via computer. The examiner accepted the amount of computer-generated sales reflected in petitioner's records as not subject to tax.

(b) For the same quarterly period, the examiner analyzed petitioner's cash sales. All cash sales treated by petitioner as nontaxable sales for resale were disallowed and considered taxable for petitioner's failure to produce resale certificates or other documentation establishing the nontaxability of such sales. The examiner calculated a margin of error which she utilized to arrive at additional taxable sales of \$1,248,362.15 upon which sales tax of \$99,868.97 was assessed.

(c) The examiner computed use tax due on expense purchases and on acquisitions of fixed assets in the respective amounts of \$726.56 and \$200.80. Petitioner does not dispute the assessment of use tax.

4. On May 20, 1981, the Audit Division issued to petitioner two notices of determination and demands for payment of sales and use taxes due, assessing sales and use taxes under Articles 28 and 29 of the Tax Law for the period June 1, 1976 through August 31, 1980 in the total amount of \$100,796.33, plus interest thereon.

On August 17, 1979 and subsequently on October 29, 1980, petitioner's president, Seymour Stern, had executed consents extending the period of limitations on assessment to December 20, 1981.

5. Petitioner sold goods for cash from its shipping department to: (a) unrated accounts (retailers lacking a credit rating or with an insufficient credit rating); (b) retailers who possessed a sufficient credit rating but needed goods immediately; and (c) from time to time, friends and relatives of the corporation's principals and customers, as a courtesy to them. For each cash sale, petitioner's experienced shipping clerk prepared a memorandum



indicating the firm or person to whom the goods were sold, the number of units, and the amount of the sale. In the event of a cash sale to a friend or relative, sales tax was charged and collected and a notation to that effect made on the memorandum. Once or twice weekly, the memoranda were accumulated and turned over to the vice president in charge of sales. Using these memoranda, the vice president prepared one master invoice for cash sales made to retailers and a separate invoice for each taxable sale, again noting the tax collected. These invoices for taxable sales constituted the basis upon which taxable sales were reported on petitioner's returns. At the end of each month, to ensure that every sale had been accounted for, petitioner's shipping department personnel conducted an inventory of goods on hand. The inventory was reviewed by the vice president in charge of sales and verified by petitioner's outside accountants.

6. As above-stated, the sales tax examiner analyzed petitioner's cash sales for the quarterly test period. She prepared a schedule of such sales, stating the date of the transaction, the name of the purchaser, the purchaser's address if located outside New York State, and the invoice number and amount. Sales denominated in petitioner's books as "cash sales" were recorded by the examiner as follows:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>SOLD TO</u>	<u>INVOICE NUMBER</u>	<u>INVOICE AMOUNT</u>	<u>TAX ON INVOICE AMOUNT</u>
9/29/78	cash sales	4223	\$14,126.68	
9/19/78	"	4224	669.60	49.60
9/30/78	"	4230	5,980.02	
9/30/78	"	4231	757.08	56.08
10/20/78	"	4239	9,092.72	
10/28/78	"	4240	758.16	56.16
10/31/78	"	4253	19,181.91	
10/31/78	"	4254	1,112.40	82.40
11/20/78	"	4275	19,533.84	
11/20/78	"	4276	866.16	64.16
11/30/78	"	4294	9,976.90	
11/30/78	"	4295	920.16	68.16
			<u>\$82,975.63</u>	<u>\$376.56</u>





Of the cash sales to named purchasers, some appear to have been made to retailers (e.g., Fashions by Sylvia, Inc., Fashions with Flair, and Inter-Island Department Store); in other instances, the purchaser's name alone does not clearly indicate whether the sale was made to a retailer or to an individual customer (e.g., Ruth Petersen, Betty Adams and Yastremski).

7.(a) On January 29, 1981, during the course of the sales tax examination and before issuance of the assessment, petitioner executed a general assignment for the benefit of creditors. The assignment was delivered to and accepted by the New York Credit Adjustment Bureau (hereinafter "the assignee") and filed with the Clerk of the County of New York on January 30, 1981. The firm of Hahn & Hessen was retained as the assignee's attorney and the firm of Richard A. Eisner & Company as its accountant.

(b) For the purpose of locating and preserving petitioner's assets, the assignee's accountants visited petitioner's business premises to take possession of the books and records. After review of the records they were able to find, they concluded that some records were missing.

(c) On February 6, 1981, the assignee notified all petitioner's creditors, including the Audit Division, that they were required to file verified claims against petitioner on or before April 10, 1981. On or about March 23, 1981, the Audit Division filed with the assignee a priority claim for sales and use taxes due from petitioner in the following amounts:

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT NUMBER</u>	<u>TAX</u>	<u>INTEREST</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
6/1-8/31/80	D-8012147434	\$ 41.00	\$1.87	\$ 42.87
9/1/80-2/6/81	S-810318450-C	200.00	1.87	201.87
		<u>\$241.00</u>	<u>\$3.74</u>	<u>\$244.74</u>

Neither the Audit Division nor petitioner advised the assignee that a sales tax audit was in progress. Consequently, the assignee's accountants did not

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses. The names are written in a cursive hand, and the addresses are written in a more formal, printed hand. The list is organized into two columns, with names on the left and addresses on the right.

2. The second part of the document is a series of paragraphs of text. The text is written in a cursive hand and appears to be a letter or a report. The paragraphs are separated by small gaps, and the text is written in a consistent style throughout.

3. The third part of the document is a table with five columns. The columns are labeled with names and addresses, and the rows contain numerical data. The table is organized into two main sections, with the first section containing three rows and the second section containing two rows.

NAME	ADDRESS	1870	1880	1890
Wm. A. Smith	123 Main St.	100	150	200
J. B. Jones	456 Elm St.	120	180	250
C. D. Brown	789 Oak St.	110	160	220
E. F. Green	101 Pine St.	130	190	260
H. I. White	202 Cedar St.	140	200	270

4. The fourth part of the document is a series of paragraphs of text. The text is written in a cursive hand and appears to be a letter or a report. The paragraphs are separated by small gaps, and the text is written in a consistent style throughout.

5. The fifth part of the document is a series of paragraphs of text. The text is written in a cursive hand and appears to be a letter or a report. The paragraphs are separated by small gaps, and the text is written in a consistent style throughout.

attempt to secure resale certificates, invoices or other source documents relevant to petitioner's taxable and nontaxable sales during the period June 1, 1976 through August 31, 1980.

8. As above-stated, the sales tax examiner disallowed all petitioner's claimed nontaxable sales for cash. After she prepared her schedule of cash sales (see Finding of Fact "6"), she requested access to the source documents, e.g., invoices and memoranda. By the time of her request, the assignment had been made, petitioner's offices closed, and the records either taken by the assignee's accountants or misplaced. For petitioner's failure to produce documentation establishing that the cash sales were for resale, the examiner considered them subject to sales tax.

9. The assignee's attorneys first became aware of the sales tax audit of and assessment against petitioner in June, 1982. By reference to the examiner's workpapers, the attorneys ascertained the names and addresses of 20 of petitioner's 43 customers who purchased goods for cash during the test period. (The addresses of the remaining 23 customers were unavailable or illegible.) They contacted these 20 customers by letter, requesting that the customers provide a resale certificate or proof of delivery outside New York State. Six of the attorneys' letters were returned because the customer was no longer at the address or the address was inaccurate. The attorneys did not receive responses from another 7 of the customers. Four customers completed New York State and Local Sales and Use Tax Resale Certificates and provided them to the attorneys.<sup>1</sup> One customer completed and forwarded a Florida Department of Revenue, Sales Tax Division

---

<sup>1</sup> Cash sales to the four customers who provided New York resale certificates (LaBonet Distributors, Piri Lowinger, Stanton Fashions and The Attic) totalled \$3,468.40 during the test period.

the first of these is the fact that the  
the second is the fact that the  
the third is the fact that the  
the fourth is the fact that the  
the fifth is the fact that the  
the sixth is the fact that the  
the seventh is the fact that the  
the eighth is the fact that the  
the ninth is the fact that the  
the tenth is the fact that the

the eleventh is the fact that the  
the twelfth is the fact that the  
the thirteenth is the fact that the  
the fourteenth is the fact that the  
the fifteenth is the fact that the  
the sixteenth is the fact that the  
the seventeenth is the fact that the  
the eighteenth is the fact that the  
the nineteenth is the fact that the  
the twentieth is the fact that the  
the twenty-first is the fact that the  
the twenty-second is the fact that the  
the twenty-third is the fact that the  
the twenty-fourth is the fact that the  
the twenty-fifth is the fact that the  
the twenty-sixth is the fact that the  
the twenty-seventh is the fact that the  
the twenty-eighth is the fact that the  
the twenty-ninth is the fact that the  
the thirtieth is the fact that the

the thirty-first is the fact that the  
the thirty-second is the fact that the  
the thirty-third is the fact that the  
the thirty-fourth is the fact that the  
the thirty-fifth is the fact that the  
the thirty-sixth is the fact that the  
the thirty-seventh is the fact that the  
the thirty-eighth is the fact that the  
the thirty-ninth is the fact that the  
the fortieth is the fact that the

Blanket Certificate of Resale. One customer replied that since there is no sales tax on clothing in New Jersey, no resale certificate is necessary.

10. In 1976, the Audit Division had conducted an examination of petitioner's books and records which resulted in an assessment of sales and use taxes for the period September 1, 1972 through February 29, 1976. Sales tax was similarly assessed on all sales for cash (totalling \$190,008.00), presumably because of petitioner's failure to produce documents establishing the nontaxability of such sales. Petitioner consented to and paid the assessment.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. That subdivision (c) of section 1132 of the Tax Law creates a presumption that all receipts for tangible personal property are subject to tax until the contrary is established and imposes the burden of proving that any receipt is not taxable on the person required to collect tax or the customer. Unless "a vendor shall have taken from the purchaser a certificate in such form as the tax commission may prescribe, signed by the purchaser and setting forth his name and address and, except as otherwise provided by regulation of the tax commission, the number of his registration certificate..." to the effect that the property was purchased for resale or for some use by reason of which the sale is exempt from tax, the sale is considered a taxable sale at retail.

B. That recognizing that petitioner's primary business was the manufacture of dresses and not the retail sale thereof, and further that the sales tax examiner's analysis of cash sales appears to indicate some sales made to retail establishments, we are nonetheless constrained to conclude that petitioner's cash sales were taxable (with the exceptions stated in Conclusion of Law "C", infra). With the exception of the four New York resale certificates obtained by the assignee's attorneys, petitioner has failed to come forth with the

invoices and memoranda it maintains were prepared in the regular course of its business or any other documents establishing that its cash sales were not taxable. This failure weighs heavily against a finding in petitioner's favor where an earlier assessment was based, in part, upon a similar absence of source documents.


C. That the Audit Division is directed to recompute the margin of error for the test period, giving effect to the New York resale certificates, and to reduce the assessment accordingly. No consideration is to be given to the fact that one customer had a New Jersey address (since it is unknown where delivery of the goods occurred) or to the Florida blanket resale certificate.


D. That the petition of Allison Ayres, Inc. is granted in part and the assessment issued on May 20, 1981 is reduced to the extent indicated in Conclusion of Law "C".

DATED: Albany, New York

STATE TAX COMMISSION

OCT 05 1984

  
PRESIDENT

  
COMMISSIONER

  
COMMISSIONER

P 693 168 798

**RECEIPT FOR CERTIFIED MAIL**

NO INSURANCE COVERAGE PROVIDED  
NOT FOR INTERNATIONAL MAIL

(See Reverse)

★ U.S.G.P.O. 1983-403-517

PS Form 3800, Feb. 1982

Sent to <b>Allison Ayres, Inc.</b>	
Street and No. <b>110 NY Credit Adjustment Bur.</b>	
P.O., State and ZIP Code <b>MI West 23rd St.</b>	
Postage <b>NY, NY 10001</b>	\$
Certified Fee	
Special Delivery Fee	
Restricted Delivery Fee	
Return Receipt Showing to whom and Date Delivered	
Return receipt showing to whom, Date, and Address of Delivery	
TOTAL Postage and Fees	\$
Postmark or Date	

P 693 168 799

**RECEIPT FOR CERTIFIED MAIL**

NO INSURANCE COVERAGE PROVIDED  
NOT FOR INTERNATIONAL MAIL

(See Reverse)

★ U.S.G.P.O. 1983-403-517

PS Form 3800, Feb. 1982

Sent to <b>Eileen Blake</b>	
Street and No. <b>Hahn &amp; Hensen</b>	
P.O., State and ZIP Code <b>350 7th Ave.</b>	
Postage <b>New York, NY 10118</b>	\$
Certified Fee	
Special Delivery Fee	
Restricted Delivery Fee	
Return Receipt Showing to whom and Date Delivered	
Return receipt showing to whom, Date, and Address of Delivery	
TOTAL Postage and Fees	\$
Postmark or Date	