POOR QUALITY THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT (S) ARE FADED & BLURRED

PHOTO MICROGRAPHICS INC.

BUREAU OF LAW

MEMORANDUM Teffer, Melven &
Edith

TO:

The State Tax Commission

FROM:

Francis V. Dov. Meering Officer

SUBJECT:

In the Matter of the Petition of Melvin and Edith Poffer for a Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Personal Income Taxes under Article 22 of the Tax Law for

the Year 1961

A hearing with reference to the above matter was held before me at 80 Centre Street, New York, New York on October 1. 1967. The appearances and the exhibits produced were as shown in the stenographic minutes submitted herewith,

The taxpayer filed a segresident income tax return for the year 1961 in which he reported salary income claimed to have been earned within and without the State in the amount of \$10.093.64 which he allocated on the besis of 250 work days during the year of which 88 were days that he was required to work without the State of New York. Of the 88 days, 68 were days on which he worked at his New Jersey home and 20 were days worked at a hospital in Massachusetts.

A motice of deficiency and statement of sudit changes were issued on April 13, 1965 disallowing the allocation on the basis that apportionment of income on the basis of days worked in a temperer's personal residence is not permitted unless the work is expressly required to be performed outside of New York State by texpayor's employer. Personal income tex and interest liability for 1961 was determined to be in the sum of \$170.94.

The temperer is a professor of psychology and the Director of Clinical Training in the Department of Paychology, Forkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University. He was provided an office at the University. The school also had a library. These facilities were available to the tempager during the times that he worked at home. The tempayer contended that he could not perform his duties at the University because of the lack of facilities for his library and research materials and that the facilities furnished by the University were too acisy and that he was subject to too many interruptions there. The work performed at home by the taxpayer consisted of analysing research data, writing up the results of such analysis and conforring with students.

The taxpayer worked 20 days at a hospital in Worcester, Massachusetts where he was engaged in research as part of his duties for his employer. The hospital in Massachusetts was a proper place for the conduct of his research.

It is my opinion that the taxpayers are not entitled to an allocation of income for work performed at home on 68 days since such work does not constitute services rendered without the State of New York in accordance with the provisions of Section 632(e), Article 22 of the Tax Law and that the work was done at home primarily for the taxpayer's greater convenience in accordance with decisions of <u>Burke v. Brazelini</u>, et al., 10 A D 2d 674, and <u>Morehouse v. Murnhy</u>, 10 A D 2d 764. The taxpayers, however, are entitled to an allocation for work performed in Massachusetts on 20 days.

For the reasons stated above, I recommend that the decision of the State Tax Commission modifying the netice of deficiency by reducing it by the amount of \$43.20 and otherwise denying the taxpayers' petition be substantially in the form submitted herewith.

/s/	FRANCIS V. DOW	
	Hearing Officer	

PVD:rlp Enc. December 11, 1967

12-15-67

/s/ A. B. MANLEY

IN THE MATTER OF THE PRETITION

07

MELVIN AND EDITE PROPER

FOR A REDETERMINATION OF A DEFICIENCY OR FOR REFUND OF PERSONAL INCOME TAXES UNDER ARTICLE 22 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE TEAR 1961.

The tampayers having filed a potition for a redetermimation of a deficiency or for refund of personal income taxes
under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the year 1961 and a hearing
having been held in connection therevith at the office of the
State Tax Commission, 80 Centre Street, New York, New York, on
October 3, 1967 before Francis V. Dow, Hearing Officer of the
Department of Taxation and Finance at which hearing the taxpayer,
Malvin Foffer, appeared and testified and the record having been
duly examined and considered,

The State Tax Commission hereby finds:

- (1) That the taxpayers filed a nonresident income tax return for the year 1961 in which they reported salary income claimed to have been earned within and without the State in the amount of \$10,093.64 which was allocated on the basis of 250 work days of which 88 were days on which the taxpayer, Malvin Peffer, was required to work without the State of New York.
- (2) That a notice of deficiency and statement of audit changes were issued on April 13, 1965 disallowing the allocation on the basis that apportionment of income on the basis of days worked in a taxpayer's personal New Jersey residence is not permitted unless the work is expressly required to be performed outside of New York State by the taxpayer's amployer; that the taxpayer's

personal income tax and interest due was determined to be in the sum of \$170.94.

- (3) That the taxpayer, Melvin Peffer, is a prefessor of psychology and the director of clinical training in the Department of Psychology, Perkauf Graduate School, Yeakiva University; that his detice consisted of teaching and supervising students, administrative functions, evaluating internables for students, evaluating research facilities, and receases.
- (4) That the taxpayer worked 20 days in Vercenter, Nassachusetts where he was engaged in research at a hospital located there; that the research was denducted as part of his dubics in behalf of his employer; that it was necessary for the taxpayer to work at the hospital located in Norcester, Massachusetts for the purpose of such research.
- (5) That the taxpayer was provided an effice at the University; that the University also had a library which was available for use by the taxpayer; that these facilities were available to the taxpayer during the times that he worked at his New Jersey home; that the taxpayer worked at home 68 days during the year; that the taxpayer was not required by his employer to work at home; that the work performed at home by the taxpayer consisted of analyzing the research data, writing up the results of such analysis and conferring with students.

Based upon the foregoing findings and all of the evidence presented herein, the State Tax Commission hereby DECIDES:

(A) That there was no necessary ingredient required by the contract of employment, by the nature of the services performed and the formulation of judgments which necessitated the New Jersey home of the taxpayer as the locus for the performance of the tampayer's services; that such services performed in New Jerosy could have been performed at Tashiva University.

- (3) That the State Tax Commission properly disallered any allocation of income outside of the State for services performed by the temperer at his New Jersey home.
- (C) That the taxpayers, however, are entitled to an allocation of income for services perfermed outside the State on 20 days in the Massachusette hospital since it was substantiated that work was required to be performed 20 days there as part of the duties of the taxpayer, Melvin Peffer, for Yoshiva University.
- (5) That the calaxy income of the tempeyers is allocated as follows:

Salary carned in <u>Salary West State</u>

New York verkdays 230 x \$10,093.64 - \$9,286.14

(E) That the taxpayer's New York income is recomputed as follows:

Corrected New York income \$9,856.1% Standard deduction (10% of income) 986.61

Balance \$8,397.53

Exemptions 2,460.60

Taxable income 5,797.53

Tax on income \$207.88
Statutory credits 25.00
New York tax 152.58
Tax previously stated 74.62
Personal income tax due \$105.26
Interest computed to 19.48
April 13, 1965
Total Taxes and Interest \$127.74

(7) That the notice of deficiency and statement of audit changes (7:10 No. 1-6708452) are medified by cancelling the additional income tax and interest due for the year 1961 to the extent of \$43,20; that the taxpayer's 1961 income tax and

interest computed to April 13, 1965, the date of the metice of deficiency in the medified amount of \$127.74 is correct; that the notice of deficiency and statement of audit changes as modified do not include any tax or other charges which could not be lawfully demanded; that the tempayers' petition for a redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of personal income taxes as medified be and the same is hereby demied.

Dated: Albany, New York this 17th day of January

1968.

STATE TAI CONCINCION

/s/	JOSEPH H. MURPHY
	Touce Manley