In the Matter of the Petition

of

EDWARD I. KULICK

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) 1963, 1964 and: 1965.

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 20thday of May, 1974, she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon Edward I. Kulick

(representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows: Mr. Edward I. Kulick
1601 South Ocean Drive
Hollywood, Florida 33020

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

20th day of May

, 1974

Jan the Dunier

In the Matter of the Petition

of EDWARD I. KULICK

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)1963, 1964, 1965.

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 7th day of May , 1974, she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon Edward I. Kulick

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

Mr. Edward I. Kulick
33 Vanderveer Court
Rockville Centre, 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

7th day of May

1974.

AD-1.30 (1/74)

In the Matter of the Petition

of

EDWARD I. KULICK

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) 1963, 1964, : 1965.

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 7th day of May , 1974, she served the within Notice of Decision (or Determination) by (certified) mail upon Borow & Borow

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

Borow & Borow

30 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10017

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

√7+h day of May

1974

Frankla 3 per 100



STATE TAX COMMISSION

STATE OF NEW YORK

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

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

A. BRUCE MANLEY
MILTON KOERNER

DATED:

Albany, New York

May 7, 1974

Mr. Edward I. Kulick 33 Vanderveer Court Rockville Centre, New York

Dear Mr. Kulick:

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

of

Please take further notice that pursuant to **section 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,

L. Robert Leisner

HEARING OFFICER

cc Petitioner's Representative Law Bureau

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

EDWARD I. KULICK

DECISION

for a Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Unincorporated Business Taxes under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the Years 1963, 1964 and 1965.

Petitioner, Edward I. Kulick, petitioned for a redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of unincorporated business taxes for the years 1963, 1964 and 1965.

A formal hearing was held before L. Robert Leisner, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, 80 Centre Street, New York, New York, on March 2, 1971.

Petitioner was represented by Harry Borrow, C.P.A. of Borrow & Borrow and the Income Tax Bureau was represented by Edward H. Best, Esq., (Alexander Weiss, Esq., of Counsel).

ISSUES

- I. Did the activities of Edward I. Kulick as a sales representative for a number of handbag concerns in 1963, 1964 and 1965, constitute the carrying on of an unincorporated business under section 703 of the Tax Law?
- II. Was the petitioner subject to a penalty under section 685(a) of the Tax Law?

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner, Edward I. Kulick, timely filed New York State income tax returns, but did not file unincorporated business tax returns for the years 1963, 1964 and 1965.

Rockville Centre, New York 33 Vanderveer Court Department of Taxation and Finance STATE OF NEW YORK ALBANY, N. Y. 12227 STATE CAMPUS AD 32 (6-73) 250M

- 2. A Notice of Determination of a Deficiency in unincorporated business tax for the years 1963, 1964 and 1965 was issued on September 25, 1967, against Edward I. Kulick under File No. 48073274. The taxpayer petitioned for a redetermination of the deficiency or for refund of unincorporated business taxes for the years 1963, 1964 and 1965.
- 3. Petitioner, Edward I. Kulick, was a commission salesman representing five or six handbag companies during each of the years in issue. Petitioner had one major line, several auxiliary lines and a few incidental lines or casual sales. In 1965, for example, petitioner received commissions in approximate amounts as follows:

Sterling Handbags	\$16,151.88
Lewis Purses	8,623.89
Merit	4,626.74
Another company	23.65
Another company	34 . 9 7
Another company	1,233.26

- 4. Petitioner had been brought into selling work as a child and had been a handbag salesman for forty-five years for various companies. Petitioner added and dropped lines over the years.

 Some of the main companies petitioner represented went out of business and petitioner then represented new companies. Petitioner could not represent other companies who had competitive merchandise.
- 5. Petitioner received monthly commission statements. The statements contained deductions for phone, post cards, and advertising. Commissions were paid only on merchandise shipped. All orders were subject to acceptance by the companies. Credit had to be approved. Allowances and discounts were between the companies and the customers.
- 6. Petitioner received a 20% discount for gifts of handbags which was the same discount as others working for the concerns. Petitioner had to pay 50% of the advertising charges whenever the firm had advertising contracts with customers. The customer's advertising contracts had to be approved by the companies.

7. There was no withholding of income tax or social security with any of the companies and no unemployment insurance was carried by any of the companies. With a multiline salesman there would be excessive withholding. Petitioner found it necessary to represent a number of lines because petitioner could not make enough money out of one line alone with the increased cost of traveling.

8. There was no sick leave or paid vacations. Petitioner could take vacations only when approved by the companies.

9. Petitioner had no letterhead stationery and no typewriter.
Petitioner occasionally used his daughter's student typewriter.
Petitioner had stationery expenses of Christmas cards and post cards to tell customers when he would be coming to their city. Petitioner,

- Petitioner occasionally used his daughter's student typewriter.

 Petitioner had stationery expenses of Christmas cards and post cards to tell customers when he would be coming to their city. Petitioner, on his Federal tax return, utilized a Schedule "C" to take advertising expenses, entertainment expenses, stationery expenses, phone expenses, rent expenses for the room used in his home, and other expenses, none of which were reimbursed.

 10. Petitioner's main lines had sales meetings. Wherever the
- petitioner's main lines had sales meetings. Wherever the petitioner was, he had to come to the sales meeting in New York and he had to come to the trade show in New York. He would be told by the sales manager, "This is the trip I want you to make." It could be a trip of three, four, or five weeks. Petitioner was required to report in every day when he was in the metropolitan area to his main company. Petitioner had no office or phone, but he always worked out of the office of the main company he represented.
- 11. Petitioner was required to report by mail when on the road.

 He had no final say as far as selling goods, credits, or allowances.

 If a situation came up with respect to these matters, he would discuss it with his supervisor and ask him what to do about it.
- 12. The territory petitioner covered was bounded by Washington, Boston, and Buffalo, and petitioner could make four of five trips a year. The companies specified the territory in which petitioner could sell and he was told to whom he could sell and to whom he could not sell.

-

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- A. Petitioner was not under the direction and control of the various companies from which he sold his lines. Edward I. Kulick was not an employee, but he was an independent sales agent of the companies from which he sold his lines of handbags as an independent sales representative. He was engaged in an unincorporated business, and was subject to unincorporated business taxes during the years in issue.
- B. The petition of Edward I. Kulick is denied and the determination of the deficiencies in unincorporated business taxes for the years in issue are sustained.
- C. Pursuant to the Tax Law, interest shall be added to the total amount due until paid.

DATED: Albany, New York
May 7, 1974

STATE TAX COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER