In the Matter of the Petition

of

HY FOSTER & ANNE FOSTER

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

racked Funaio

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

State of New York County of Albany

Martha Funaro , 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 19th day of January , 1972 , she served the within
Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon Hy Foster &
Anne Foster (representative of) the petitioner in the within
proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid
wrapper addressed as follows: Hy Foster & Anne Foster
32 Ridge Drive
Westbury, L.I., 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

19th day of January , 1972

Linda Wilson)

In the Matter of the Petition

of

HY FOSTER & ANNE FOSTER

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

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

State of New York County of Albany

Martha Funaro , 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 19th day of January , 1972, she served the within
Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon Hy Foster &
Anne Foster (representative of) the petitioner in the within
proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid
wrapper addressed as follows: Seymour S. Seiden, C.P.A.
386 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016

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

Linda Wilson

19th day of January , 1972.

Martha Fuxus



STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

STATE TAX COMMISSION HEARING UNIT

EDWARD ROOK
SECRETARY TO
COMMISSION

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

STATE TAX COMMISSION

NORMAN F. GALLMAN, PRESIDENT
A. BRUCE MANLEY
MILTON KOERNER

STATE CAMPUS
ALBANY, N. Y. 12227
AREA CODE 518

457-2655, 6, 7

Albany, New York

January 19, 1972

My Foster & Anne Foster 32 Ridge Brive Westbury, L.I., New York

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Poster:

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

οf

Please take further notice that pursuant to section(s)

of the Tax Law any proceeding
in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced
within after the date of this notice.

Any inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision or concerning any other matter relating hereto may be addressed to the undersigned. These will be referred to the proper party for reply.

Very truly yours,

Myel I Wry

Migel G. Wright Hearing Officer

cc Petitioner's Representative

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

f

HY FOSTER AND ANNE FOSTER

CORRECTED DECISION

for a Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Unincorporated Business Tax under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the Year 1962.

A decision having been issued on November 27, 1970, on the above entitled petition and as it now appears the decision was erroneous as to the amount because of an inadvertent mistake, as is further described below, the State Tax Commission, acting under section 697(c) of the Tax Law, hereby

FINDS:

- 1. The decision of November 27, 1970, is reaffirmed as to paragraphs "1" through "7" and the first sentence of paragraph "8" and such parts of that decision are made a part thereof.
- 2. The second sentence of paragraph "8" of the decision of November 27, 1970, reading, "Taxpayer made no attempt to prove the amount of expenses allocable to his sideline," is hereby repudiated.
- 3. It is further hereby found that the apportionment of taxpayer's expenses between his main line and his sidelines was not
 contested at the hearing and that it was agreed that such expenses
 shall be deemed apportioned according to the amounts of gross income received from each. These expenses are \$7,631.14 as shown on
 the Schedule "C" of taxpayer's Federal income tax return, as reduced
 by \$2,479.43, the amount by which these expenses were reduced upon
 Federal audit, to result in net expenses of \$5,151.71.

Upon the foregoing findings and all the evidence in the case, the State Tax Commission

DECIDES:

- A. The decision of the State Tax Commission dated November 27, 1970, is reaffirmed as to paragraph "A" and such paragraph is made a part hereof.
- B. The decision of the State Tax Commission dated November 27, 1970, is erroneous with respect to paragraph "B" by reason of assuming that taxpayer should get no benefit from his expenses and denying same as deductions in their entirety, and that such assumption would result in an assessment which would be excessive in amount and which should be abated under section 697(c) of the Tax Law.
- C. The notice of deficiency is erroneous in part and is redetermined to be \$219.33, together with such interest, if any, as may be lawful pursuant to section 684 of the Tax Law.

DATED: Albany, New York

January 19, 1972

STATE TAX COMMISSION

OMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

entre de la composition de la composit La composition de la

Fem Collins

vito en viso en de la composito di espeta di circa e secreta a zincià e se de la sectiona di propiedo del comp O secreta di circa secreta di propiedo de 1995 di crea secreta de secreta di secreta di composito de 1995 de 1 O secreta di circa di composito di composito di composito del composito de 1995 de 1995 de 1995 de 1995 de 199

The content of the second of the content of the con

one promise into the continue of the present the first in the continue of the

and the color of the color of the color

ia yozhara to mini traner.

Walter and the state of the sta



STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

STATE TAX COMMISSION HEARING UNIT

EDWARD ROOK SECRETARY TO COMMISSION

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

STATE TAX COMMISSION

NORMAN F. GALLMAN, PRESIDENT
A. BRUCE MANLEY
MILTON KOERNER

STATE CAMPUS ALBANY, N. Y. 12227

AREA CODE 518 457-2655, 6, 7

Dated: Albany, New York

January 19, 1972

Hy Foster & Anne Foster 32 Ridge Drive Westbury, L.I., New York

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Foster:

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

Please take further notice that pursuant to section(s)

722 of the Tax Law any proceeding
in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced
within 4 Months after the date of this notice.

Any inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision or concerning any other matter relating hereto may be addressed to the undersigned. These will be referred to the proper party for reply.

Very truly yours,

Nigel G. Wright Hearing Officer

cc Petitioner's Representative
Law Bureau

AD 82 (5-71) SOM Department of Taxation and Fine CERTIFIED No. 592338 STATE OF NEW YORK STATE CAMPUS A 32 Kidge Driv

Hy Foster & Anhe Foster

Out of Business.

Unclaimed__

Westbury L.J., New York

Refrised______No Such St. or #Z Maurit 198 1 1 April 1919



STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

HY FOSTER AND ANNE FOSTER

CORRECTED DECISION

for a Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Unincorporated Business Tax under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the Year 1962.

A decision having been issued on November 27, 1970, on the above entitled petition and as it now appears the decision was exponeous as to the amount because of an inadvertent mistake, as is further described below, the State Tax Commission, acting under section 697(c) of the Tax Law, hereby

FINDS:

- 1. The decision of November 27, 1970, is reaffirmed as to paragraphs "I" through "7" and the first sentence of paragraph "8" and such parts of that decision are made a part thereof.
- 2. The second sentence of paragraph "8" of the decision of November 27, 1970, reading, "Taxpayer made no attempt to prove the amount of expenses allocable to his sideline," is hereby repudiated.
- 3. It is further hereby found that the apportionment of taxpayer's expenses between his main line and his sidelines was not
 contested at the hearing and that it was agreed that such expenses
 shall be deemed apportioned according to the amounts of gross income received from each. These expenses are \$7,631.14 as shown on
 the Schedule "C" of taxpayer's Federal income tax return, as reduced
 by \$2,479.43, the amount by which these expenses were reduced upon
 Federal audit, to result in net expenses of \$5,151.71.

STATE TAX COMMESSION

m the Metter of the Scittion

to

PETRON RULA CMA HINTRON YE

CORRECTED DECISION

for a Redetermination of a stickency for Yor Leftend of Valuetorozated Masi- verse Tax Test of the Test tax for the Test tax for the Year 1962.

A decipion having been seved on Movement 27, 1970, on the above ontitled petition and so it now appears the decision was extensive, as the decision was extensive, as the the described totow, the take the Commission, acting under westion 697(a) of the Tax lew hereby

* SCIMIT

- 1. The lagision of Formber 27, 1970, he reafilteed as to paragraphs "I" through "" and the ilret sembence of rangraph "B" and each sembence of rangraph. "B" and each semble of that fortified or made a part thereor.
- 2. The percond sontence of paragraph "6" of the decision of Movember 27. 1976, canding. "Tarpey's made no attempt to prove the absorb of exempt to his admitted in hereby resultated
- It is further hereny found that the departionment of the sayer's expenses between his main sine and his sidelines was not contacted at the hearing and that it was agreed that such expenses shall be demied approximated at the proteins of the same to capatabounts of processing come received from buth. These axionses are \$7,631,14 to shows on the face follows in the face follows the face was a radioed by \$7,631,14 to show the book and seed are return, as radioed by \$7,631,150 to the radio educate are returned to the radio of t

Upon the foregoing findings and all the evidence in the case, the State Tax Commission

DECIDES:

- A. The decision of the State Tax Commission dated November 27, 1970, is reaffirmed as to paragraph "A" and such paragraph is made a part hereof.
- B. The decision of the State Tax Commission dated November 27, 1970, is erroneous with respect to paragraph "B" by reason of assuming that taxpayer should get no benefit from his expenses and denying same as deductions in their entirety, and that such assumption would result in an assessment which would be excessive in amount and which should be abated under section 697 (c) of the Tax Law.
- C. The notice of deficiency is erroneous in part and is redetermined to be \$219.33, together with such interest, if any, as may be lawful pursuant to section 684 of the Tax Law.

DATED: Albany, New York

January 19, 1972

STATE TAX COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER

White Manly

COMMISSIONER

White Manney

COMMISSIONER

. Deco oki di sembi 6,974 i...ig _mikadi, patosoni oki nosu ni katoni waki iisa bhi

19101020

- A. The description of the Grand that Consider the Local Process of the A.

 A section of the sect
- E. The decision of the state for an area decision dates November 21, 10

 177. In director with present to be the circ. It is expenses as ascarety, that care you should get no breath direct, his expenses and
 states pare as at light tens in their maint circ. his expenses and
 states pare as at light tons in their maint will be endpassive to amount
 tion doubt result to a states section 637(3) or the war how.

DATED LIBOUY, New Ment

MULERIMICO PLAS ESPATA

AURICH UNG KAND

ing policy and the second of t