STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COMMISSION

| In the Matter of the Petition | - |
|---|---|
| | : |
| of | |
| | • |
| NORMAN MARNER | • |
| | |
| For a Redetermination of a Deficiency or | : |
| a Revision of a Determination or a Refund | |
| of Unincorporated Business | • |
| | • |
| Taxes under Article(x) 23 of the | |

State of New York County of Albany

1969 and 1970.

Ta

John Huhn , 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 14th day of February , 19 78, she served the within Notice of Decision by (certified) mail upon Norman Marner

by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed

as follows: Mr. Norman Marner 3 Robin Way Great Neck, New York 11023

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 (XEPPERENTIXXE xxxxxx petitioner herein and that the address set forth on said wrapper is the last known address of the (representativexxixing) petitioner.

Sworn to before me this

14th day of February . 1978

and mach

John Huhn

TA-3 (2/76)

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COMMISSION

| In | the | Matter | of | the | Petition | | |
|----|-----|--------|----|-----|----------|--|--|
| of | | | | | | | |
| | | NORM | AN | MAR | NER | | |

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

State of New York County of Albany

John Huhn , being duly sworn, deposes and says that Khe is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the 14th day of February , 1978, Sche served the within Notice of Decision by (certified) mail upon Edwin Shor

٠

(representative of) the petitioner in the within proceeding,

by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed as follows: Edwin Shor, CPA Russell & Shor 26 Court Street Brooklyn, New York 11242

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

14th day of February , 1978

and mack

John Hukn

TA-3 (2/76)



JAMES H. TULLY JR., PRESIDENT MILTON KOERNER THOMAS H. LYNCH STATE OF NEW YORK STATE TAX COMMISSION TAX APPEALS BUREAU ALBANY? NEW YORK 12227

February 14, 1978

Mr. Norman Marner 3 Robin Way Great Neck, New York 11023

Dear Mr. Marner:

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

You have now exhausted your right of review at the administrative level. Pursuant to section(**3**) **722** of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision by the State Tax Commission can only be instituted under Article 78 of the Civil Practice Laws and Rules, and must be commenced in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Albany County, within **4 months** from the date of this notice.

Inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision may be addressed to the Deputy Commissioner and Counsel to the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, Albany, New York 12227. Said inquiries will be referred to the proper authority for reply.

Sincerely,

Joseph Chyl Hearing Examiner

cc: Petitioner's Representative

Taxing Bureau's Representative

TA-1.12 (6/77)

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

Petitioner, Norman Marner, residing at 3 Robin Way, Great Neck, New York 11023, filed a petition for redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of unincorporated business tax under Article 23 of the Tax Law for the years 1969 and 1970 (File No. 14237).

A small claims hearing was held before William Valcarcel, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, Two World Trade Center, New York, New York, on June 14, 1977 at 1:15 P.M. The petitioner appeared by Edwin Shor, CPA. The Income Tax Bureau appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq. (Louis Senft, Esq., of counsel).

ISSUE

Whether the income derived from petitioner's activities as a salesman during the years 1969 and 1970 was subject to unincorporated business tax.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner, Norman Marner, filed New York State income tax resident returns for the years 1969 and 1970. However, he did not file unincorporated business tax returns for these years.

2. On February 9, 1973, the Income Tax Bureau issued a Statement of Audit Changes against petitioner, asserting unincorporated business tax in the sum of \$1,644.45 on the income derived from his activities as a salesman for the years 1969 and 1970. In accordance with the Statement of Audit Changes, the Income Tax Bureau issued a Notice of Deficiency on November 26, 1973.

3. Petitioner was a traveling salesman for the firm of Georges Briard, Inc. He was compensated for the sales he made on a commission basis. His principal did not withhold any payroll taxes, nor did it reimburse him for the selling expenses he incurred.

4. Georges Briard, Inc. restricted the petitioner's sales territory and required that he file a weekly report. It did not exercise any control over his sales endeavors, nor did it control or regulate the manner in which petitioner attempted to solicit business.

5. Georges Briard, Inc. required the petitioner to pursue collections and customer's complaints, as well as attend its

- 2 -

showroom at certain times. He was also required to attend, organize and pay for exhibits at trade shows conducted within his sales territory.

6. Petitioner was permitted to sell a noncompeting line of merchandise for the firm of Cobell, Inc. Petitioner conceded that the income derived from his selling activities for Cobell, Inc. was subject to unincorporated business tax.

7. The firms that petitioner represented did not control the time or effort which he expended in conducting his sales activities.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. That sufficient direction and control was not exercised over the activities of the petitioner by Georges Briard, Inc. to result in an employee-employer relationship, in accordance with the meaning and intent of section 703(b) of the Tax Law.

B. That the activities of petitioner, Norman Marner, during the years 1969 and 1970 constituted the carrying on of an unincorporated business. Therefore, the income derived from his selling activities for Georges Briard, Inc. and Cobell, Inc. was subject to unincorporated business tax in accordance with the meaning and intent of section 701 of the Tax Law.

- 3 -

C. That the petition of Norman Marner is denied and the Notice of Deficiency issued on November 26, 1973 in the sum of \$2,657.94 is sustained, together with such additional interest as may be lawfully owing.

DATED: Albany, New York February 14, 1978 STATE TAX COMMISSION

PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER