#### STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter	of the Petition
	:
	of
PHILIP MON	NHEIT
	inn af a Dafinianan an
	ion of a Deficiency or
	corporated Business
Taxes under Articl	e(s) 23 of the

Tax Law for the (Year(s) 1964

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

State of New York County of Albany

, being duly sworn, deposes and says that Lynn Wilson she is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of , 19 72, she served the within age, and that on the 26th day of April Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon PHILIP MONHEIT

(representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows: Philip Monheit

ll Brookfield Road New Hyde Park, 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

26th day of April , 1972 Lynn Wilson Wearther Fundre

## STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter	of the Petition
	of
PHILIP MON	HEIT
	ion of a Deficiency or
a Refund of Uninco Taxes under Article	prporated Business e(s) 23 of the

Tax Law for the (Year(s) 1964

wrapper addressed as follows:

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

State of New York County of Albany

Lynn Wilson , being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of , 19 72, she served the within age, and that on the 26th day of April Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon MILTON MALTZ, C.P.A.

(representative of) the petitioner in the within

proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid

Milton Maltz, C.P.A. 30 East 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

, 1972. 26th day of April the + Maaco

Lynn Wilson



# STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

STATE TAX COMMISSION

NORMAN F. GALLMAN, PRESIDENT A. BRUCE MANLEY MILTON KOERNER BUILDING 9, ROOM 214A

**STATE CAMPUS ALBANY, N. Y. 12227** AREA CODE 518 457-2655, 6, 7 STATE TAX COMMISSION HEARING UNIT

> EDWARD ROOK SECRETARY TO COMMISSION

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

DATED: Albany, New York April 26, 1972

Mr. Philip Monheit 11 Brookfield Road New Hyde Park, New York

Dear Mr. Monheit:

Please take notice of the **DECISION** 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,

myel 1 Wmy

of

Migel G. Wright Hearing Officer

cc Petitioner's Representative Law Bureau

## STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition	:	
of	:	
PHILIP MONHEIT	:	DECISION
for a Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Unincorporated Business	:	
Tax under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the Year 1964.		
	:	

Philip Monheit filed a petition for redetermination of a deficiency in unincorporated business taxes under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the year 1964.

A hearing was held on June 23, 1971, before Nigel G. Wright, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, 80 Centre Street, New York City. Milton Maltz, C.P.A. represented the petitioner. Edward H. Best, Esq., (Francis X. Boylan, Esq., of Counsel) represented the Income Tax Bureau. The record of said hearing has been duly examined and considered.

## ISSUE

The issue in this case is whether amounts received as a salary by petitioner were received for services which constitute part of his unincorporated business within the meaning of section 703(b) of the Tax Law.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

 Mr. Monheit filed a return for unincorporated business taxes in 1964 on income of \$10,316.08 received from the business of "diamond importing". Mr. Monheit purchased and imported large sized rough diamonds which were then cut and sold by him to dealers who supplied retail jewelers. These stones usually would be used as "solitaires" in engagement rings. He has been in this business since 1943.

2. Petitioner was retained by Belgo African Diamonds, Inc. as a salesman. He received wages of \$7,800 from Belgo in 1964 and both income taxes and social security were withheld from these wages. He had no financial interest in Belgo. Belgo is a dealer in "chips", small diamonds which were purchased in Belgium and sold to manufacturers of jewelry.

3. Mr. Monheit had an office at 36 West 47th Street with a receptionist. This is paid for in part by Belgo. The receptionist is paid by Belgo. The office had work tables and turning wheels. As is the custom in the trade, Mr. Monheit contracted with technicians to come to his office to cut and polish the larger stones.

4. The customers for the solitaire diamonds are completely different from the customers for Belgo.

5. The deficiency in issue is dated January 22, 1968, and \$319.71 plus interest of \$53.12 for a total of \$372.83.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The services in question were performed as part of petitioner's unincorporated business. It is clear from testimony that Belgo retained petitioner because he was already engaged in the diamond business. Furthermore, there is no evidence in the record that Belgo supervised the petitioner's day-to-day methods of operations and no other evidence that would tend to show that petitioner was truly an employee.

- 2 -

# DECISION

-:3 -

The petition is denied and the deficiency is found due together with such interest, if any, as may be due under section 684 of the Tax Law.

DATED: Albany, New York april 26, 1972. STATE TAX COMMISSION

Umm Gallman

anley COMMISSIONER

Kreiner

COMM