Unincorp Bus Fax Determin A-Trigodner, Samuel

STATE OF REAL YORK ESTATE TAX CONFIDENCE

. 4

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION

CF

CAPURL WICCOMPR

PUB REVISION OR PEPEERS OF UNINCOMPORATED DUBLISHED TAXES UNDER ARTICLE 16-A OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE YEARS 1949, 1990, 1991 AND 1950.

Semuel Wigodmer, the tempeyor herein, having filed appliestions for revision or refund of unincorporated business taxes under Article 16-A of the Tax Law for the years 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952 and a hearing motion having been mailed to the tempered an Jenuary 13, 1965 scheduling a hearing at 80 Centre Street, New York City. N.Y. for Pebpuary 4. 1965 at 10:30 efelock A. M. bufore Solomon Gios. Rearing Officer of the Department of Texation and Pinamos, and the taxoner hering defaulted in appearance thereof and the metters as presently constituted, having been duly exemined and employed,

The State Tax Commission hereby finder

(1) That the tempayor filed personal income tam returns for the years 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952 reporting compensation received from three (3) firms located in New York City during the year 1949 and from four (%) fires located in New York City during the years 1950, 1951 and 1952; that based upon field audit, the Department of Taxation and Finance made assessments against the temperor for the years 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952 (Assessment Ros. FA-95103, FA-95104, PA-95105 and FA-95106, respectively) helding that the setivities of the tempayor during the aforementioned years constituted the corrying on of an unincorporated business subject to tax under the previous of Article 16-A of the Tex Low and paratited an allocation of 25% of

total business income attributable to sources within the State of New York but disallowed a portion of business expenses for lack of substantiation.

. 1

- (2) That the temparer was a sales representative for various
 firms, whom he represented, receiving commission on a straight commismion besit; that each of the principals deducted Federal withholding
 tames from the commissions paid the temparer; that the temparer on his
 males trips would exhibit lines of the various principals he represented,
 which were non-competitive, to the same emsteners; that the temparer was
 not reintured by the principals for any of his travelling expenses.
- show your assistants for each of the years involved hereing that the showpoon assistants consisted of models; that the models would buy on samples in order to show the merchandise to the prospective buyers at the showpoon of one of the principals, didney Bellev & Co.; that is addition, the assistants would help contact the buyers when they were in New York for the purpose of making arrangements for the tampayer so that he could show the line to said prospective buyers; that although the assistants were regularly employed by the principal, Pidney Bellev & Co., each salesman was charged with his proportionate share of the charge of the service paid by the principal; that the tampayer did not maintain any office.
- (4) That the temperer was not subject to the direction of contwol of the communies when he represented as to the number in which he was to make such sales; that the relationship of the temperer and the principals, when he represented, was that of an independent contractor and not that of an employer-employee.
- cating a portion of his sales outside of the State of New York was entitled to an allocation of income to the extent of 255 thereof attribatable to the State of New York; that the tampayer was entitled to an allocation for the year 1969 of \$9,018,63; for the year 1950, of \$13,352.21; for the year 1951 of \$16,613.25 and for the year 1958 of

. of \$14.370.07.

income was attributable to sources outside the State of New York, he was not entitled to a deduction for travelling expenses in connection with said income; that the tempayor has failed to substantiate buck-ness expenses in the assumt of \$1,250,00 for each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952; that the tempayor was entitled to deduct \$35 of his expenses attributable to income within the State of New York; that the assume to which the tempayor was entitled to deduct \$35 of his expenses attributable to income within the State of New York; that the grown of such expenses to which the tempayor was entitled to deduct was \$1,646.69 for the year 1949; for the year 1950, \$2,950.05; for the year 1951, \$2,955.00.

Based upon the foregoing findings, the State for Countration bereity

STITES INTE

- therein, for the years 1969, 1950, 1951 and 1952 constituted the corresponding on of an unincorporated business within the intent and meaning of Section 386, Article 16-A of the Tax Law, then in effect, prior to its amendment by Chapter 723 of the Laws of 1953 effective as of Jennety 1, 1953.
- (2) That the temperer's bestmess income during the years haveteriors mentioned was attributable to sources both within and without the State of New York; that 2% of his total business income for the aforementioned years was attributable to the State of New York.
- (C) That 25% of the tempeyor's business expenses exclusive of travelling expenses was attributable to the State of New York for each of the years 1969, 1950, 1951 and 1952; that the tempeyor failed to substantiate a portion of business expenses for the years 1969, 1950, 1951 and 1952 to the extent of \$1,250.00 for each of said years; that the tempeyor is only entitled to deduct the business expenses as set forth in Finding So. (6) above.
- (D) That, accordingly, the assessments (Assessment Nos. FA-95203, FA-95204, FA-95205 and FA-95206 for the years 1949, 1950,

1951 and 1952, respectively) are correct; that said assessments do not include any tax or other charge which could not have been law-fully demanded and that the taxpayer's applications for revision or refund with respect to said assessments be and the same are hereby demind.

DATED: Albeny, New York on the 26 th

607 of april , 1965.

/s/

JOSEPH H. MURPHY

/s/

IRA J. PALESTIN

Count of Land

BUREAU OF LAW

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Commissioners Murphy, Palestin & Macduff

FROM:

Solomon Sies, Hearing Officer

SUBJECT:

SAMUEL WIGODNER

1949 Assessment No. AB-FA-95103 1950 Assessment No. AB-FA-95104 1951 Assessment No. AB-FA-95105 1952 Assessment No. AB-FA-95106

Article 16-A

A hearing with reference to the above matter was scheduled before me at 80 Centre Street, New York, N.Y. for February 4, 1965. The taxpayer defaulted in appearance at such a hearing.

The issues involved herein are: (1) whether the activities of the taxpayer, as a sales representative for several principals during the years in question, constituted the carrying on of an unincorporated business; (2) whether the taxpayer, as an independent contractor, maintaining no office within the state, is entitled to an allocation of income on sales consummated outside the state and (3) whether a portion of total deductions for business expenses was properly disallowed for lack of substantiation.

The taxpayer was a sales representative, for three principals in 1949 and four principals during each of the other years involved, in the sale of ladies' sportswear on a straight commission basis. Each of the principals deducted Federal withholding taxes. The taxpayer on his sales trips would exhibit the lines of the various principals whom he represented, which were non-competitive, to the same customers. The taxpayer was not reimbursed by any of the principals for any of his expenses.

The Income Tax Bureau on field audit, permitted an allocation of 75% of income on sales consummated outside the state of New York and 25% of gross income attributable to New York on sales consummated in New York. Where business is carried on both within and without the state of New York, only that part of the net income which is derived from business carried on within the state is subject to business tax (Manual of Policy-Business Tax Article, Page 1--5/15/59).

Section 386 of the Tax Law was amended, effective as of January 1, 1953, so as to provide that "a person shall not be deemed to be engaged in an anincorporated business solely because of selling

TO:

Commissioners Murphy, Palestin & Macduff

Page 2

RE:

SAMUEL WIGODNER

goods, wares and merchandise for more than one firm, person or corporation unless he maintains an office or employs one or more assistants or else regularly carries on a business. The Income Tax Bureau, therefore, determined that the taxpayer was liable for unincorporated business taxes for the years in question but not for subsequent years.

The file indicates that the taxpayer was not subject to the direction or control of the companies whose products he sold as to the manner in which he was to make such sales. The taxpayer salesman was, therefore, not an employee of the several firms whom he represented on a commission basis but was an independent contractor carrying on an unincorporated business and thus subject to the payment of unincorporated business tax under Article 16-A, Section 386 of the Tax Law then in effect (See Peo. ex rel. Feinberg V. Chapman, 274 App. Div. 715 and Matter of Sullivan Co.. Inc. 289 N.Y. 110, 112.).

The business expenses deducted by the taxpayer on his income tax return for the year 1952 in the sum of \$9,590.61 were estimated. For the year 1952, on field audit, the Income Tax Bureau disallowed the sum of \$1,750.00 of such expenses as unsubstantiated and imposed an additional normal tax in the sum of \$110.25. In addition, a disallowance of \$1,250.00 expenses for unincorporated business tax was made for all of the years in question. No deduction was allowed for travelling expenses as these expenditures were deemed wholly attributable to earnings outside the state of New York.

I am of the opinion, therefore, that the assessments should be sustained.

For the reasons stated above, I recommend that the determination of the Tax Commission in this matter be substantially in the form submitted herewith.

MAR	2	ĥ	1965	

"SOLOMON SIES

Hearing Officer

Approved