

STATE OF NEW YORK  
STATE TAX COMMISSION

*Goldberg*  
JST-1970

In the Matter of the Petition

of

WILLIAM GOLDBERG

For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or  
a Refund of Unincorporated Business  
Taxes under Article(8) 23 of the  
Tax Law for the (Year(8) 1962

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING  
OF NOTICE OF DECISION  
BY (CERTIFIED) MAIL

*Dec 99-251*

State of New York  
County of Albany

Margaret Ann Wood, being duly sworn, deposes and says that  
she is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of  
age, and that on the 10th day of March, 1970, she served the within  
Notice of Decision (~~and Determination~~) by (certified) mail upon Morris  
Horowitz (representative of) the petitioner in the within  
proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid  
wrapper addressed as follows: Morris Horowitz  
120 West 42nd Street  
New York, New York

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 Post Office Department within the State of New York.

That deponent further says that the said addressee is the (representative  
of) 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

10th day of March, 1970

*James W. [Signature]*

*Margaret Ann Wood*

STATE OF NEW YORK  
STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

WILLIAM GOLDBERG

For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or  
a Refund of Unincorporated Business :  
Taxes under Article ~~(a)~~ 23 of the  
Tax Law for the (Year ~~(a)~~) 1962 :

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING  
OF NOTICE OF DECISION  
BY (CERTIFIED) MAIL

State of New York  
County of Albany

Margaret Ann Wood , being duly sworn, deposes and says that  
she is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of  
age, and that on the 10th day of March , 19 70, she served the within  
Notice of Decision (~~said Determination~~) by (certified) mail upon William  
Goldberg (~~representative of~~) the petitioner in the within  
proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid  
wrapper addressed as follows: William Goldberg  
Laurel Cove Road, Box 236  
Oyster Bay, New York

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 Post Office Department within the State of New York.

That deponent further says that the said addressee is the (~~representative~~  
~~of~~) 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

10th day of March , 1970.

John Wright

Margaret Ann Wood

STATE OF NEW YORK  
STATE TAX COMMISSION

---

In the Matter of the Petition	:	
of	:	
WILLIAM GOLDBERG	:	DECISION
For a Redetermination of a Deficiency	:	
or for Refund of Unincorporated Business	:	
Taxes under Article 23 of the Tax Law	:	
for the Year 1962	:	

---

The taxpayer having filed a petition pursuant to Sections 722 and 689 of the Tax Law for a redetermination of deficiency determined under date of December 13, 1965, of Unincorporated Business Taxes imposed by Article 23 of the Tax Law for the Year 1962 and a hearing having been duly held and the record having been duly examined and considered,

The State Tax Commission hereby

FINDS:

(1) The sole issue raised at the hearing is whether the taxpayer is exempt from the Unincorporated Business tax because his activities as a sales representative were carried on as an employee and not as an independent contractor (Tax Law Sec 703(f); (See Reg. 20 NYCRR 281.3(1)). The amount of such deficiency of \$398.82, with interest, is not in dispute.

(2) The taxpayer appears to be a factory representative for furniture manufacturers.

(3) The taxpayer received income from sales made for the following manufacturers: Woodland Furniture Co. of Lowell Inc., \$11485.34; Atlantic Furniture Products Co., Inc., \$9466.97; Deena Products Co., \$3165.86; York Plastic Products Mfg. Corp., \$671.13;

1. General Information  
 2. Background  
 3. Objectives  
 4. Methodology  
 5. Results  
 6. Conclusions  
 7. References  
 8. Appendices  
 9. Tables  
 10. Figures  
 11. Summary  
 12. Conclusion  
 13. References  
 14. Appendices  
 15. Tables  
 16. Figures  
 17. Summary  
 18. Conclusion  
 19. References  
 20. Appendices  
 21. Tables  
 22. Figures  
 23. Summary  
 24. Conclusion  
 25. References  
 26. Appendices  
 27. Tables  
 28. Figures  
 29. Summary  
 30. Conclusion  
 31. References  
 32. Appendices  
 33. Tables  
 34. Figures  
 35. Summary  
 36. Conclusion  
 37. References  
 38. Appendices  
 39. Tables  
 40. Figures  
 41. Summary  
 42. Conclusion  
 43. References  
 44. Appendices  
 45. Tables  
 46. Figures  
 47. Summary  
 48. Conclusion  
 49. References  
 50. Appendices  
 51. Tables  
 52. Figures  
 53. Summary  
 54. Conclusion  
 55. References  
 56. Appendices  
 57. Tables  
 58. Figures  
 59. Summary  
 60. Conclusion  
 61. References  
 62. Appendices  
 63. Tables  
 64. Figures  
 65. Summary  
 66. Conclusion  
 67. References  
 68. Appendices  
 69. Tables  
 70. Figures  
 71. Summary  
 72. Conclusion  
 73. References  
 74. Appendices  
 75. Tables  
 76. Figures  
 77. Summary  
 78. Conclusion  
 79. References  
 80. Appendices  
 81. Tables  
 82. Figures  
 83. Summary  
 84. Conclusion  
 85. References  
 86. Appendices  
 87. Tables  
 88. Figures  
 89. Summary  
 90. Conclusion  
 91. References  
 92. Appendices  
 93. Tables  
 94. Figures  
 95. Summary  
 96. Conclusion  
 97. References  
 98. Appendices  
 99. Tables  
 100. Figures  
 101. Summary  
 102. Conclusion  
 103. References  
 104. Appendices  
 105. Tables  
 106. Figures  
 107. Summary  
 108. Conclusion  
 109. References  
 110. Appendices  
 111. Tables  
 112. Figures  
 113. Summary  
 114. Conclusion  
 115. References  
 116. Appendices  
 117. Tables  
 118. Figures  
 119. Summary  
 120. Conclusion  
 121. References  
 122. Appendices  
 123. Tables  
 124. Figures  
 125. Summary  
 126. Conclusion  
 127. References  
 128. Appendices  
 129. Tables  
 130. Figures  
 131. Summary  
 132. Conclusion  
 133. References  
 134. Appendices  
 135. Tables  
 136. Figures  
 137. Summary  
 138. Conclusion  
 139. References  
 140. Appendices  
 141. Tables  
 142. Figures  
 143. Summary  
 144. Conclusion  
 145. References  
 146. Appendices  
 147. Tables  
 148. Figures  
 149. Summary  
 150. Conclusion  
 151. References  
 152. Appendices  
 153. Tables  
 154. Figures  
 155. Summary  
 156. Conclusion  
 157. References  
 158. Appendices  
 159. Tables  
 160. Figures  
 161. Summary  
 162. Conclusion  
 163. References  
 164. Appendices  
 165. Tables  
 166. Figures  
 167. Summary  
 168. Conclusion  
 169. References  
 170. Appendices  
 171. Tables  
 172. Figures  
 173. Summary  
 174. Conclusion  
 175. References  
 176. Appendices  
 177. Tables  
 178. Figures  
 179. Summary  
 180. Conclusion  
 181. References  
 182. Appendices  
 183. Tables  
 184. Figures  
 185. Summary  
 186. Conclusion  
 187. References  
 188. Appendices  
 189. Tables  
 190. Figures  
 191. Summary  
 192. Conclusion  
 193. References  
 194. Appendices  
 195. Tables  
 196. Figures  
 197. Summary  
 198. Conclusion  
 199. References  
 200. Appendices  
 201. Tables  
 202. Figures  
 203. Summary  
 204. Conclusion  
 205. References  
 206. Appendices  
 207. Tables  
 208. Figures  
 209. Summary  
 210. Conclusion  
 211. References  
 212. Appendices  
 213. Tables  
 214. Figures  
 215. Summary  
 216. Conclusion  
 217. References  
 218. Appendices  
 219. Tables  
 220. Figures  
 221. Summary  
 222. Conclusion  
 223. References  
 224. Appendices  
 225. Tables  
 226. Figures  
 227. Summary  
 228. Conclusion  
 229. References  
 230. Appendices  
 231. Tables  
 232. Figures  
 233. Summary  
 234. Conclusion  
 235. References  
 236. Appendices  
 237. Tables  
 238. Figures  
 239. Summary  
 240. Conclusion  
 241. References  
 242. Appendices  
 243. Tables  
 244. Figures  
 245. Summary  
 246. Conclusion  
 247. References  
 248. Appendices  
 249. Tables  
 250. Figures  
 251. Summary  
 252. Conclusion  
 253. References  
 254. Appendices  
 255. Tables  
 256. Figures  
 257. Summary

100-443887-100  
 : 100

1. The above information was obtained from the files of the FBI, New York Office, and is being furnished to you for your information.

not available - no protocol noted as source is considered reliable (C)

[illegible]

Farber Bros. Furniture Mfg. Co., Inc., \$185.85.

(4) The taxpayer's wife appeared on behalf of taxpayer but the taxpayer, himself, did not appear or testify and such absence is unexplained. The taxpayer's wife testified that Woodland Furniture Co. did not have a showroom in New York in direct contradiction to a letter submitted by Woodland Furniture Co. and no explanation, therefore, is apparent.

(5) Petitioner presented letters from Woodland Furniture Co., Atlantic Furniture Products Co., Inc., and York Plastic Products Mfg. Corp. These are dated about two months after the petition was filed and are completely identical in language. They state as follows: "His duties in addition to selling included the following: 1- Being at our showroom in New York every Friday for meetings and to show our line to all prospective buyers whether they were his accounts or not. 2- Help set up displays at our showrooms. 3- Take care of complaints in his territory. 4- Attend our company's furniture shows in New York and at our factory. 5- Wait on all our customers at these shows."

(6) Mr. Goldberg is not reimbursed for expenses of traveling or entertaining.

(7) The taxpayer has control over which companies he represents and the territories he wishes to cover.

Upon the foregoing findings and all the evidence presented herein, the State Tax Commission hereby

DECIDES:

A. The primary legal issue in this case is whether any of the manufacturers retaining the taxpayers services exercised such control over his activities as to constitute him an employee rather than an independent contractor.

B. While selling goods for more than one enterprise does not

W. J. ... Inc., Inc., Inc., Inc.

(1) The ... wife appeared on ... of ...

The ... did not appear to ... and ...  
... wife ...  
... in New York in direct ...  
... and no ...  
... ..

(2) ... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..

(3) ... ..

... ..

(4) The ... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

alone subject the taxpayer to the Unincorporated Business tax (Tax Law Sec 703(f)) it is evidence of carrying on a business when there is no explanation of how each of the enterprises together with the others can control the activities of the taxpayer.

C. Evidence will be construed most strongly against the taxpayer when knowledge of the facts is uniquely within his capacity and he does not testify (Richardson on Evidence Sec. 92; Petition of Robert Gordon, October 20, 1969).

D. While letters from employers are sometimes acceptable to the Commission they are entitled to very little weight when they are obviously dictated by the taxpayer himself. Furthermore, such letters are not from persons not connected with the matters in dispute and so are of little value in proving the custom or usage in a trade.

E. The taxpayer has the burden of proof on all issues to show his status under the unincorporated business tax; taxpayer has not sustained the burden of showing his exclusion therefrom.

F. The taxpayer is engaged in an unincorporated business.

G. The petition for redetermination of the deficiency is denied and the notice of deficiency in the amount of \$318.82 is affirmed together with such interest, if any, as may be lawfully due under Sec 684 of the Tax Law.

Dated: Albany, New York

STATE TAX COMMISSION

March 9, 1970

Norman Hillman  
PRESIDENT

Bruce Mauley  
COMMISSIONER

Matt Koehn  
COMMISSIONER

along which the taxpayer to the United States business (the law sec 703(c)) is in evidence of carrying on a business.

There is no explanation of how each of the independent business

with the other can control the activities of the taxpayer.

4. The taxpayer will be considered as a taxpayer against the

taxpayer when included in the tax is entirely within the

company and is not jointly (included on evidence sec. 703;

petition of Robert Gordon, October 20, 1955).

5. While letters from employers are considered according to

the Commission they are entitled to very little weight when they

are obviously dictated by the taxpayer himself. Furthermore, such

letters are not from persons not connected with the taxpayer in

dispute and so are of little value in proving the cause or cause

in a trade.

6. The taxpayer has the burden of proof on all issues to

show his status under the independent business law; taxpayer has

not sustained the burden of showing his independent character.

7. The taxpayer is engaged in an independent business.

8. The petition for reclassification of the deficiency is

denied and the notice of deficiency in the amount of \$115.00 is

affirmed together with any interest, if any, as may be lawfully

due under sec 6611 of the tax law.

STATE OF NEW YORK

Robert A. Albert, for Petitioner

March 9, 1956

\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES J. ALBERT

\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES J. ALBERT

\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES J. ALBERT