HEARING UNIT - FILO COL.

TAX PERSONAL INCOME TAXES

ART. 16 SESS.

MEY WORDS UNSUbstantingon

Itemized Deductions

CEGGS FORD.

ASE LAW SITATIONS

STATE OF NEW YORK
STATE TAX COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATIONS OF

VINCENT A. THIEMANN

FOR REVISION OR REFUND OF PERSONAL INCOME TAXES UNDER ARTICLE 16 OF THE TAX LAW FOR THE YEARS 1955 AND 1956

Vincent A. Thiemann, having filed an application for revision or refund under Article 16 of the Tax Law for each of the calendar years 1955 and 1956, and a hearing having been held in connection therewith at the New York City office of the Bureau on June 19, 1964 at which the taxpayer appeared and testified, before Laurence S. Gifford, Hearing Officer, of the Department of Taxation and Finance, and the matter having been duly examined and considered, the State Tax Commission hereby finds:

1. That the taxpayer filed returns of income under Article 16 of the Tax Law for each of the calendar years 1955 and 1956; the 1955 return having been filed on or before the due date for filing thereof, namely, April 15, 1956, and the 1956 return having been filed on or before the due date for filing thereof, namely, April 15, 1957; that on each of such returns the taxpayer claimed itemized deductions, including the following specific deductions:

	1955	1956
Apportioned home expense	<u>\$132.99</u>	\$132.01
Sales taxes Auto and gas taxes Trans. & utility taxes	\$221.10 89.00 43.21	\$224.40 89.00 45.56
Misc. other taxes Total other taxes	144.40 \$497.71	124.60 \$483.56

2. That on audit of such returns so filed, the Income Tax Bureau disallowed the amount claimed each year for apportioned home expense as not representing ordinary and necessary expenses within the meaning and intent of the Tax Law; that in addition the Income Tax Bureau disallowed \$200.00 of the total amount claimed for miscellaneous taxes, the disallowance being based upon the grounds that the total as originally claimed was excessive.

3. That belief the such distillusions, additional normal taxes under Arcicle 16 of the rex Law are appeared against the taxpayer on March 4, 1989 and the amount of (110) for 1955 and \$11.95 for 1956.

4. That thereafter in April 14, 1939 the tempager filed applications for revision or reduced whereby he requested the cancellation of additional taxes assessed for 1933 and 1935 (Paregraph No. 3 about); that in addition the taxpayer claimed or such applications a refund of original taxes paid in the amount of \$60.25 for 1955 and in the amount of \$63.49 for 1955, such refund claims being based upon the grounds that the taxpayer was entitled to additional deductions (in addition to the amounts claimed on returns filed) as follows:

Additional deductions for miscellaneous taxes	1955	1056
	(1190 <b>,</b> 56	\$1281.79
Commutation expense	\$1.50.CO	\$150,00

5. That the said 1955 application for revision or refund filed, as aforesaid, on April 14, 1959 was not Alled althin two years of the date of the filing of the 1955 return (Paragraph No. 1 above) but such 1955 application was filed within one year of the date of issuance of the additional 1955 takes of Gills on March L. 1977 that the date of filing of the 1955 application (namely, on 1941 14, 1959) was within two years of the filling of the 1955 application. (namely, on 1941 14, 1959) was within two years of the filling of the 1955 application.

5. That at the hearing it was not show that the tempayer incurred miscollaneous tames, either in 1996 or 1996, in amount of the respective amount allieund in the tem recommission reflected in the assessments here at issue, namely, in cases or 9297.71 for 1995 and \$283.56 for 1996.

7. That at the hearing it was not shown that any portion or chainer one so-salled them expense or commission aspense claimed by the same per represented endinging and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the respective temable years in correct on his occupation; nor was it that any portion thereof are incurred or paid for the

Upon the foregoing findings and all the evidence presented herein, the State Tax Commission hereby

DETERMINES:

That the taxpayer is not entitled to any deduction in computing net income under Article 16 of the Tax Law in addition to those respectively allowed in the recomputations of his tax liability for 1955 and 1956 as reflected in the assessments levied on March 4, 1959 (Paragraphs No. 2 and 3 above); that accordingly the taxpayer is not entitled to any revision or refund of taxes assessed and/or paid under Article 16 of the Tax Law for either of the years 1955 or 1956.

Dated: Albany, N. Y.,

July 25,

1969.

THE STATE TAX COMMISSION

Commissioner

Commissioner

0.....