In the Matter of the Petition

οf

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

State of New York County of

Catherine Steele , 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 4th day of October , 19 76, she served the within

Notice of Decision by (certified) mail upon Gerald & Judith Lasman

(representative ref) the petitioner in the within proceeding, by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed

as follows:

Mr. & Mrs. Gerald Lasman

15 Connor Avenue

Metuchen, New Jersey 08840

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 rote the) petitioner.

Sworn to before me this

4th day of October

and mack

, 1976

Catherine Stock



STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

TAX APPEALS BUREAU

STATE CAMPUS ALBANY, N.Y. 12227

ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

October 4, 1976

TELEPHONE: (518) 457-3850

Mr. & Mrs. Gerald Lasman 15 Connor Avenue Metuchen, New Jersey 08840

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Lasman:

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

Please take further notice that pursuant to Section(x) 690 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.

Very truly yours,

Frank J. Puccia
Supervisor of Small

Claims Hearings

cc: Bekknienerkschernssenastene:

Taxing Bureau's Representative:

Enc.

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

GERALD and JUDITH LASMAN

DECISION

for Redetermination of Deficiency or for Refund of Personal Income Taxes under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the Year 1972.

Petitioners, Gerald and Judith Lasman, residing at 15 Connor

Avenue, Metuchen, New Jersey 08840, have filed a petition for

redetermination of deficiency or for refund of personal income tax

under Article 22 of the Tax Law for the year 1972. (File No. 2-23216099).

A small claims hearing was held before Joseph Chyrywaty, Hearing Officer,

at the offices of the State Tax Commission, Department of Taxation and

Finance, Two World Trade Center, New York, New York, on June 7, 1976,

at 9:15 A.M. Petitioners appeared pro se. The Income Tax Bureau

appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq., (Louis Senft, Esq. of counsel).

1:SSUE

Were the 63 days worked at home in New Jersey by petitioner,
Gerald Lasman, during the year 1972, allocable as days worked outside
New York State?

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Petitioners, Gerald Lasman and Judith Lasman, filed a joint New York State income tax nonresident return for 1972. They allocated the income received by the petitioner, Gerald Lasman, based upon the number of days he alleged to have worked within and without New York State during 1972. Included in the total days worked outside New York State were 63 days worked at petitioner's New Jersey home.
- 2. On August 25, 1975, the Income Tax Bureau issued a Notice of Deficiency against the petitioner, Gerald Lasman, in the amount of \$297.40 plus interest of \$52.68 for a total amount due of \$350.08. The additional amount of tax due resulted from the Income Tax Bureau's disallowance of the 63 days worked at the petitioner's New Jersey home.
- 3. Petitioner, Gerald Lasman, a New Jersey resident, was employed as a shoe salesman for Caressa, Inc. during 1972. Caressa, Inc. maintains their home office in Miami, Florida. His responsibility as an outside salesman included the solicitation of business in the Northeastern United States. He also had the availability of a New York City showroom which he used on a regular basis, one day a week, for the purpose of showing customers his company's product. There were no desk or other facilities provided for him at the New York City location; however, there was a secretary's office.

4. Petitioner, Gerald Lasman, maintained an office in his
New Jersey home during the year 1972. The office was equipped with
a filing cabinet, desk and telephone. He used this office for the
purpose of making appointments, contacting customers, maintaining
records and writing orders. He assumed all the expenses for this
office.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- A. Petitioner, Gerald Lasman, failed to submit sufficient documentary or other evidence which would show that his commission income was subject to the provisions of section 131.15 of the Personal Income Tax Regulations (20 NYCRR 131.15).
- B. That petitioner, Gerald Lasman, was not required by necessity to perform services for his employer outside of New York State on the days he worked at his home in New Jersey, but rather such services were performed there for his greater convenience and that the income derived therefrom constitutes income attributable to New York sources in accordance with the meaning and intent of section 632(c) of the Tax Law. That the nature of his work was such that his employer could have furnished facilities for his use in New York State similar to his facilities in New Jersey.

C. That the petition of Gerald and Judith Lasman is denied and the Notice of Deficiency issued August 25, 1975, is sustained.

DATED: Albany, New York October 4, 1976 STATE TAX COMMISSION

PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER