In the Matter of the Petition

of

ARCHIE E. ARMER

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or a Revision of a Determination or a Refund of Unincorporated Business Tax

Taxes under Article (%) 23 of the Tax Law for the Year(s) OXX REMINDER XXX 1968 through 1973

State of New York County of Albany

Bruce Batchelor , 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 June , 19 77, She served the within

Decision by (xerrificed) mail upon Archie E. Armer

(representative xef) the petitioner in the within proceeding,
by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed
as follows: Archie E. Armer

4705 N. Line, RD #5
Ballston Spa, New York 12020

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 Postal Service within the State of New York.

Sworn to before me this

7th day of June , 1977

anet mack

Bruce Batchelor

TA-3 (2/76)

In the Matter of the Petition

of

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

State of New York County of Albany

Bruce Batchelor , being duly sworn, deposes and says that **The is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 7th day of June , 19 77, *The served the within Decision by (**Rentification*) mail upon Frank V.

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

Edwards, Williams, McManus, Ricciardelli & Coffey, P.C. Box 599, Quaker Village

Glens Falls, New York 12801 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 Postal Service within the State of New York.

That deponent further says that the said addressee is the (representative of the) 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 June, 1977

anet mack

Rrue Rotately

TA-3 (2/76)



_

STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

TAX APPEALS BUREAU

STATE CAMPUS ALBANY, N.Y. 12227 ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

June 7, 1977

TELEPHONE: (518) 457-1723

Mr. Archie E. Armer 4705 N. Line, RD #5 Ballston Spa, New York 12020

Dear Mr. Armer:

Please take notice of the **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 from the date of this notice.

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

Enc.

Payl 8. Coburn

Supervising Tax Hearing Officer

cc:

Petitioner's Representative:

Frank V. Williams, CPA

Edwards, Williams, McManus, Ricciardelli & Coffey, P.C.

Box 599, Quaker Village XHARINGORNANOGERAPHICANISTORY:

Glens Falls, New York 12801

Taxing Bureau's Representative:

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petitions

of

ARCHIE E. ARMER

DECISION

for a Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Unincorporated Business Tax under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the Years 1968 through 1973.

Petitioner, Archie E. Armer, who resides at 4705 North Line, RD # 5, Ballston Spa, New York 12020, has filed petitions for a redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of unincorporated business tax under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the years 1968 through 1973. (File No. 10041).

A formal hearing was held before Paul B. Coburn, Hearing
Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, Building 9,
State Campus, Albany, New York, on December 14, 1976, at 10:45 a.m.

Petitioner appeared by Frank V. Williams, C.P.A., of the firm of Edwards, Williams, McManus, Ricciardelli and Coffey, P.C. The Income Tax Bureau appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq. (Harris C. Sitrin, Esq., of counsel).

ISSUES

I. Whether the selling activities of petitioner, Archie E. Armer, during the years 1968 through 1973, constituted the carrying on of an unincorporated business.

II. Whether petitioner, Archie E. Armer, had reasonable cause for failing to file New York State unincorporated business tax returns and pay unincorporated business tax for the years 1968 through 1973, so as to justify the setting aside of penalties imposed.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Petitioner, Archie E. Armer, never filed an unincorporated business tax return for the years 1968 through 1973 inclusive.
- 2. The petitioner did file New York State residence tax returns for the years 1968 through 1973 inclusive.
- 3. On March 25, 1974, a Statement of Audit Changes was issued against the petitioner for unincorporated business tax plus penalties and interest in the amount of \$9,889.37 for the years 1968, 1969 and 1970. Thereafter and on June 24, 1974, a Statement of Audit Changes was issued against the petitioner for unincorporated business tax plus penalties and interest in the sum of \$856.32 for the year 1971. Thereafter, a Statement of Audit Changes was issued against the petitioner for unincorporated business tax plus penalties and interest in the amount of \$2,239.12 for the years 1972 and 1973. Said Statement of Audit Changes having been dated February 24, 1975. Accordingly, the Income Tax Bureau thereafter issued Notices of Deficiency.

- 4. During the years 1968 through 1973 inclusive, petitioner, Archie E. Armer, sold multi-line products for three firms, namely Modern Miltex Corp. of 280 East 134th Street, Bronx, New York; Polymer Tempera of 129 Corporation Way, Medford, Massachusetts; and Belmont Industries, Inc. The petitioner covered specified territories and accounts for the companies he represented, which territories were assigned by the companies in question.
- 5. The petitioner did not maintain an office or place of business and employed no assistants. Such office space and assistants, as needed, being supplied by the companies represented by the petitioner.
- 6. There was no arrangement between the petitioner and any of the companies which he represented as to the division of his time and work effort. The petitioner's time and effort was divided among the companies he represented as needed in order to cover each assigned territory and account.
- 7. That the petitioner was not free to accept work from other companies. Such requests were submitted by the petitioner and denied by the companies he represented.
- 8. The petitioner received a draw against his commissions and was obligated to absorb all expenses personally. Petitioner

never filed a federal Schedule C, instead, deducting his expenses under employee business expense. From this draw against commissions, social security was deducted by some of the companies petitioner represented some of the time. Petitioner's representative acknowledged in his arguments that on other occasions social security was not deducted.

- 9. The firms for whom the petitioner, Archie E. Armer, sold products did not exercise substantial direction or control over his sales activities and tactics or over the time he devoted to sales.
- 10. That under somewhat similar but unrelated conditions, the petitioner, Archie E. Armer, was previously determined by representatives of the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance to be an employee of the companies for which he sold and not subject to payment of an unincorporated business tax.
- 11. That there was no written agreement between the petitioner or the companies he represented.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. That the income received by the petitioner, Archie E. Armer, from the firms he represented during the years 1968 through 1973 constituted income from his regular business as a multiline salesman, and not compensation as an employee exempt from

the imposition of the unincorporated business tax in accordance with the meaning and intent of section 703(b) of the Tax Law.

- B. That the activities of the petitioner, Archie E. Armer, during the years 1968 through 1973 constituted the carrying on of an unincorporated business and his income derived therefrom was subject to the unincorporated business tax in accordance with the meaning and intent of section 703 of the Tax Law.
- C. That the petitioner, Archie E. Armer, had reasonable cause for failing to file New York State unincorporated business tax returns for the years 1968 through 1973 inclusive, having previously been found by the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, while engaged in somewhat similar but unrelated activities to have been an employee not subject to the unincorporated business tax and having relied upon such prior determination in failing to file the unincorporated business tax returns in question. Therefore, the penalties assessed against the petitioner, Archie E. Armer, are waived.
- D. That the petitions of Archie E. Armer are granted to the extent of cancelling the penalties imposed by the Income Tax Bureau for the years 1968 through 1973 inclusive, and except as so granted the petitions are in all other respects denied.

DATED: Albany, New York
June 7, 1977

OMMTSSTOMO

COMMISSIONER