

STATE OF NEW YORK

DIVISION OF TAX APPEALS

In the Matter of the Petition :
of :
WANDA CARTER : DETERMINATION
for Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of : DTA NO. 827582
New York State Personal Income Tax under Article 22 :
of the Tax Law for the Year 2012. :

Petitioner, Wanda Carter, filed a petition for redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of New York State personal income tax under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the year 2012.

The Division of Taxation, by its representative, Amanda Hiller, Esq. (Michele Milavec, Esq., of counsel), brought a motion dated July 28, 2016, seeking an order dismissing the petition, or in the alternative, summary determination in the above-referenced matter pursuant to sections 3000.5, 3000.9(a)(1)(i), and 3000.9(b) of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Tax Appeals Tribunal. Petitioner, appearing by American Tax Consultants Group (Lanre Adeyan-Ju, EA), did not file a response to the Division's motion. Based upon the motion papers, the affidavits and documents submitted therewith, and all pleadings and documents submitted in connection with this matter, Kevin R. Law, Administrative Law Judge, renders the following determination.

ISSUE

Whether petitioner filed a timely Request for Conciliation Conference with the Bureau of Conciliation and Mediation Services following the issuance of a Notice of Deficiency for the year 2012.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The subject of the motion of the Division of Taxation (Division) is the timeliness of petitioner's protest of a Notice of Deficiency dated May 28, 2015 and bearing assessment identification number L-042573363 (the notice). The notice is addressed to petitioner, Wanda Carter, at an address in Staten Island, New York.

2. Petitioner filed a Request for Conciliation Conference with the Division's Bureau of Conciliation and Mediation Services (BCMS) in protest of the May 28, 2015 notice. The request was faxed to BCMS on January 11, 2016.

3. On January 29, 2016, BCMS issued a Conciliation Order Dismissing Request to petitioner. The order determined that petitioner's protest of the notice was untimely and stated, in part:

“The Tax Law requires that a request be filed within 90 days from the date of the statutory notice. Since the notice(s) was issued on May 28, 2015, but the request was not received until January 11, 2016, or in excess of 90 days, the request is late filed.”

4. Petitioner filed a petition with the Division of Tax Appeals in protest of the conciliation order on April 12, 2016.

5. To show proof of proper mailing of the notice, the Division provided the following with its motion papers: (i) an affidavit, dated July 6, 2016, of Mary Ellen Nagengast, a Tax Audit Administrator 1 and Director of the Division's Management Analysis and Project Services Bureau (MAPS); (ii) a “Certified Record for Presort Mail - Assessments Receivable” (CMR) postmarked May 28, 2015; (iii) an affidavit, dated July 7, 2016, of Bruce Peltier, a stores and mail operations supervisor in the Division's Mail Processing Center (Center); (iv) a copy of the notice with the associated mailing cover sheet; and (v) a copy of petitioner's New York State

personal income tax return for the year 2012 (form IT-201) filed with the Division on September 15, 2014, which lists the same address for petitioner as that listed on the subject notice. The IT-201 was the last return filed with the Division by petitioner before the notice was issued.

6. The affidavit of Mary Ellen Nagengast, who has been in her current position since October 2005, sets forth the Division's general practice and procedure for processing statutory notices. Ms. Nagengast is the Director of MAPS, which is responsible for the receipt and storage of CMRs, and is familiar with the Division's Case and Resource Tracking System (CARTS) and the Division's past and present procedures as they relate to statutory notices. Statutory notices are generated from CARTS and are predated with the anticipated date of mailing. Each page of the CMR lists an initial date that is approximately 10 days in advance of the anticipated date of mailing. Following the Division's general practice, this date was manually changed on the first and last pages of the CMR in the present case to the actual mailing date of "5/28/15." In addition, as described by Ms. Nagengast, generally all pages of the CMR are banded together when the documents are delivered into possession of the United States Postal Service (USPS) and remain so when returned to the Division. The pages of the CMR stay banded together unless otherwise ordered. The page numbers of the CMR run consecutively, starting with "PAGE: 1," and are noted in the upper right corner of each page.

7. All notices are assigned a certified control number. The certified control number of each notice is listed on a separate one-page mailing cover sheet, which also bears a bar code, the mailing address and the Departmental return address on the front, and taxpayer assistance information on the back. The certified control number is also listed on the CMR under the heading entitled "Certified No." The CMR lists each notice in the order the notices are generated

in the batch. The assessment numbers are listed under the heading "Reference No." The names and addresses of the recipients are listed under "Name of Addressee, Street, and P.O. Address."

8. The CMR in the present matter consists of 28 pages and lists 306 certified control numbers, along with corresponding assessment numbers, names and addresses. Each page of the CMR includes 11 such entries with the exception of page 28, which contains 9 entries. Ms. Nagengast notes that the copy of the CMR that is attached to her affidavit has been redacted to preserve the confidentiality of information relating to taxpayers who are not involved in this proceeding. A USPS employee initialed each page of the CMR, and affixed a USPS postmark dated May 28, 2015 to each page as well.

9. Page 5 of the CMR indicates that a Notice of Deficiency with certified control number 7104 1002 9730 0476 7134, and assessment number L-042573363 was mailed to petitioner at the Staten Island, New York, address listed on the subject notice of deficiency. The corresponding mailing cover sheet attached to the Nagengast affidavit bears this certified control number and petitioner's name and address as noted.

10. Page 28 of the CMR also indicates that a Notice of Deficiency with certified control number 7104 1002 9730 0476 9633 and assessment number L-042573363 was sent to "Larry Adeyan-Ju, PO Box 21005, Royal Palm Beach, Fl 33421." An enclosure with the notice states that a copy of the notice was forwarded to Mr. Adeyan-Ju because the Division's records indicate that a power of attorney is on file for the tax matters at issue in the notice.

11. The CMR also reflects that two pieces of mail were pulled from the run, and these deletions are reflected in the change to the listing for total pieces received at the post office. A piece of mail may be pulled for any number of reasons including, but not limited to, a discrepancy in a name or address. Any piece of mail so pulled is segregated from the remaining

group of statutory notices for correction and issuance at another time. The specific pulled items appear on pages 11 and 18, and a line has been drawn through the entries on the CMR for these items to indicate that they were pulled from the run. There are no such lines drawn on or near the CMR listing pertaining to petitioner. The preprinted number “306,” as appearing next to the heading “Total Pieces and Amounts,” on the last page of the CMR was crossed out and replaced with the handwritten number “304” to reflect the 2 pieces pulled from the run.

12. The affidavit of Bruce Peltier, a supervisor in the mail center since 1999 and currently a stores and operations supervisor, describes the Center’s general operations and procedures. The Center receives the notices and places them in an “Outgoing Certified Mail” area. Mr. Peltier confirms that a mailing cover sheet precedes each notice. A staff member retrieves the notices and mailing cover sheets and operates a machine that puts each notice and mailing cover sheet into a windowed envelope. Staff members then weigh, seal and place postage on each envelope. The first and last pieces listed on the CMR are checked against the information contained on the CMR. A clerk then performs a random review of 30 or fewer pieces listed on the CMR by checking those envelopes against the information contained on the CMR. A staff member then delivers the envelopes and the CMR to one of the various USPS branches located in the Albany, New York, area. A USPS employee affixes a postmark and also places his or her initials or signature on the CMR, indicating receipt by the post office. Here, as noted, the USPS employee initialed each page and affixed a postmark dated May 28, 2015 to each page of the CMR.

13. The Center further requests that the USPS either circle the total number of pieces received or indicate the total number of pieces received by writing the number on the CMR. Here, the USPS employee complied with this request by writing the number “304” on the last

page next to the heading “Total Pieces Received at Post Office.” The affixation of the postmarks and the Postal Service employee’s initials and handwritten number indicate that a total of 304 articles of mail listed on the CMR were delivered to the USPS on May 28, 2015.

14. According to the Peltier affidavit, a copy of the notice was mailed to petitioner on May 28, 2015, as claimed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. As noted, the Division brings a motion to dismiss the petition under section 3000.9(a) of the Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules) or, in the alternative, a motion for summary determination under section 3000.9(b). As the petition in this matter was filed within 90 days of the conciliation order (*see* Finding of Fact 4), the Division of Tax Appeals has jurisdiction over the petition and, accordingly, a motion for summary determination under section 3000.9(b) of the Rules is the proper vehicle to consider the timeliness of petitioner’s request for conciliation conference. This determination shall address the instant motion as such.

B. A motion for summary determination “shall be granted if, upon all the papers and proof submitted, the administrative law judge finds that it has been established sufficiently that no material and triable issue of fact is presented . . .” (20 NYCRR 3000.9[b][1]).

C. Section 3000.9(c) of the Rules provides that a motion for summary determination is subject to the same provisions as a motion for summary judgment pursuant to CPLR 3212. “The proponent of a summary judgment motion must make a prima facie showing of entitlement to judgment as a matter of law, tendering sufficient evidence to eliminate any material issues of fact from the case” (*Winegrad v. New York Univ. Med. Ctr.*, 64 NY2d 851, 853 [1985], *citing Zuckerman v. City of New York*, 49 NY2d 557, 562 [1980]). As summary judgment is the procedural equivalent of a trial, it should be denied if there is any doubt as to the existence of a

triable issue or where the material issue of fact is “arguable” (*Glick & Dolleck v. Tri-Pac Export Corp.*, 22 NY2d 439, 441 [1968]; *Museums at Stony Brook v. Vil. of Patchogue Fire Dept.*, 146 AD2d 572, 573 [2d Dept 1989]). If material facts are in dispute, or if contrary inferences may be drawn reasonably from undisputed facts, then a full trial is warranted and the case should not be decided on a motion (*Gerard v. Inglese*, 11 AD2d 381, 382 [2d Dept 1960]). “To defeat a motion for summary judgment, the opponent must . . . produce ‘evidentiary proof in admissible form sufficient to require a trial of material questions of fact on which he rests his claim’” (*Whelan v. GTE Sylvania*, 182 AD2d 446, 449 [1ST Dept 1992], citing *Zuckerman* at 562).

D. Petitioner did not respond to the Division’s motion. Accordingly, she is deemed to have conceded that no question of fact requiring a hearing exists (*see Kuehne & Nagel v. Baiden*, 36 NY2d 539, 544 [1975]; *John William Costello Assocs. v. Standard Metals*, 99 AD2d 227 [1ST Dept 1984], *lv dismissed* 62 NY2d 942 [1984]). Petitioner has thus presented no evidence to contest the facts alleged in the Nagengast and Peltier affidavits; consequently, those facts are deemed admitted (*Kuehne & Nagel v. Baiden* at 544; *Whelan v. GTE Sylvania* at 449).

E. A taxpayer may protest a notice of deficiency by filing a petition for a hearing with the Division of Tax Appeals within 90 days from the date of mailing of such notice (Tax Law §§ 681[b]; 689[b]). Alternatively, a taxpayer may contest a notice by filing a request for a conciliation conference with BCMS “if the time to petition for such a hearing has not elapsed” (Tax Law § 170[3-a][a]). It is well established that the 90-day statutory time limit for filing either a petition or a request for a conciliation conference is strictly enforced and that, accordingly, protests filed even one day late are considered untimely (*see e.g. Matter of American Woodcraft*, Tax Appeals Tribunal, May 15, 2003; *Matter of Maro Luncheonette*, Tax

Appeals Tribunal, February 1, 1996). This is because, absent a timely protest, a notice of deficiency becomes a fixed and final assessment and, consequently, the Division of Tax Appeals is without jurisdiction to consider the substantive merits of the protest (*see Matter of Lukacs*, Tax Appeals Tribunal, November 8, 2007; *Matter of Sak Smoke Shop*, Tax Appeals Tribunal, January 6, 1989).

F. Where, as here, the timeliness of a request for conciliation conference or petition is at issue, the initial inquiry is whether the Division has carried its burden of demonstrating the fact and date of the mailing to petitioner's last known address (*see Matter of Katz*, Tax Appeals Tribunal, November 14, 1991). To meet its burden, the Division must show proof of a standard procedure used by the Division for the issuance of statutory notices by one with knowledge of the relevant procedures, and must also show proof that the standard procedure was followed in this particular instance (*see Matter of Katz; Matter of Novar TV & Air Conditioner Sales & Serv.*, Tax Appeals Tribunal, May 23, 1991).

G. Here, the Division has offered proof sufficient to establish the mailing of the statutory notices to petitioner and her representative on January 7, 2015. The CMR has been properly completed and therefore constitutes highly probative documentary evidence of both the date and fact of mailing (*see Matter of Rakusin*, Tax Appeals Tribunal, July 26, 2001). There are 306 certified mail control numbers listed on the CMR, minus the 2 pieces of mail pulled, for a total of 304. The USPS employee who initialed the CMR indicated, by writing the number "304" on the line stating "Total Pieces Received at Post Office," that the post office received 304 items for mailing. The affidavits submitted by the Division adequately describe the Division's general mailing procedure as well as the relevant CMR and thereby establish that the general mailing procedure was followed in this case (*see Matter of DeWeese*, Tax Appeals Tribunal, June 20,

2002). Further, the address on the mailing cover sheet and CMR conforms with the address listed on petitioner's 2012 New York State Resident Income Tax Return, which satisfies the "last known address" requirement. It is thus concluded that the Division properly mailed the notice on May 28, 2015, and the statutory 90-day time limit to file either a Request for Conciliation Conference with BCMS or a petition with the Division of Tax Appeals commenced on that date (Tax Law §§ 170[3-a][a]; 681[b]; 689[b]).

H. Petitioner's Request for Conciliation Conference was filed on January 11, 2016. This date falls after the 90-day period of limitations for the filing of such a request. Consequently, the request was untimely (*see* Tax Law §§ 681[b]; 689[b]; 170[3-a][b]) and the same was properly dismissed by the January 29, 2016 Order issued by BCMS. Petitioner has offered no claim or evidence to meet her burden to prove that a timely protest was filed before the 90-day period of limitations for challenging the notice expired.

I. The Division's motion for summary determination is hereby granted, the January 29, 2016 Conciliation Order dismissing petitioner's request for a conciliation conference is sustained and the petition is denied.

DATED: Albany, New York
November 17, 2016

/s/ Kevin R. Law
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE