BEFORE THE STATE BOARD OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF ARIZONA Bank of America Tower 101 North First Avenue - Suite 2340 Phoenix, Arizona 85003 602.528,3966

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

FRANCIS F. and JOANNE W. BONFILIO,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

20

21

22

23

24

25

VS.

Appellants,

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, Appellee. Docket No. 1845-00-I

NOTICE OF DECISION: FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The State Board of Tax Appeals, having considered all evidence and arguments presented, and having taken the matter under advisement, finds and concludes as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

For tax year 1995, Francis F. and Joanne W. Bonfilio ("Appellants"), who were Arizona residents, filed a nonresident return and paid income tax to New York. Appellants claimed a credit for the tax paid to New York on their 1995 Arizona resident income tax return. The Arizona Department of Revenue (the "Department") reviewed the return and determined that Appellants had incorrectly calculated the credit. Accordingly, the Department adjusted the credit and issued a proposed assessment of additional income tax, including interest, and a penalty for late payment.

After unsuccessfully protesting the assessment before the Department, Appellants now timely appeal to this Board.¹

DISCUSSION

The issue before the Board is whether Appellants are liable for the assessment at issue. Appellants bear the burden of proof as to all issues of fact. A.A.C. R16-3-118.

¹ Stephen Linzer recused himself from this decision.

Notice of Decision Docket No. 1845-00-I

Under A.R.S. § 43-1071, Arizona residents may claim a credit for net income tax imposed by and paid to another state. The underlying income that the tax is based upon must be derived from sources within that state and must be taxable irrespective of the resident of the recipient. *Id.* Further, the credit "shall not exceed such proportion of the tax payable under this chapter as the income subject to tax in the other state . . . and also taxable under this title bears to the taxpayer's entire income upon which the tax is imposed by this chapter." *Id*(A)(3).

During the tax year 1995, A.A.C. R15-2-1071 defined "income subject to tax" as Arizona adjusted gross income calculated pursuant to A.R.S. § 43-1071(A)(3) by adding all exemptions back. See A.A.C. R15-2-1071. The resulting figure was the denominator used to calculate the credit. Income taxable by Arizona and also subject to tax in New York was the numerator in the calculation. The percentage resulting from the division of the numerator by the denominator was multiplied by the Arizona tax liability to determine the credit allowed for taxes paid to New York. The instructions for the 1995 tax year explained this method of calculating the credit.

Appellants argue that the requirements of A.A.C. R15-2-1071 exceed the scope of the Department's authority and that the proper denominator in calculating the credit at issue is Arizona gross income *minus* exemptions and deductions. This method of calculation results in a larger credit.

The Department's regulations are presumed valid unless they are unreasonable or are in conflict with the law. The Board finds A.A.C. R15-2-1071 to be neither. The regulation applies a gross income concept to both the numerator and the denominator of the tax credit fraction. This is reasonable and in accord with the apparent objective of the statute. Appellants would apply a gross income concept to the New York income numerator of the credit fraction but a net income concept to the denominator by reducing total gross income in the denominator by exemptions and deductions. The Board finds that this approach is not in accord with the statute. Accordingly, Appellants are liable for the tax assessed.

The penalty imposed may not be abated because Appellants have not shown that their failure to pay the tax was due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect. A.R.S. § 42-1125(D) (formerly A.R.S. § 42-136). Finally, the interest at issue is made a part of the tax by statute and represents a reasonable interest rate on the tax due, therefore, it may not be abated. A.R.S. § 42-1123 (formerly A.R.S. § 42-1123); *Biles v. Robey*, 43 Ariz. 276, 286, 30 P.2d 841 (1934).

Notice of Decision Docket No. 1845-00-I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Appellants are liable for the tax assessed. A.R.S. § 43-1071; A.A.C. R15-2-1071(A).

2. Appellants have not shown that their failure to pay the tax at issue was due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect; therefore, the penalty imposed may not be abated. A.R.S. § 42-1125(D).

3. Because the interest at issue is made a part of the tax by statute and represents a reasonable interest rate on the tax due, it may not be abated. A.R.S. § 42-1123; *Biles v. Robey*, 43 Ariz. 276, 286, 30 P.2d 841 (1934).

ORDER

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal is denied, and the final order of the Department is affirmed.

This decision becomes final upon the expiration of thirty (30) days from receipt by the taxpayer, unless either the State or taxpayer brings an action in superior court as provided in A.R.S. § 42-1254.

DATED this

17th day of May

, 2001.

STATE BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

Nas

Jaglice C. Washington, Chairperson

17 JCW:ALW

18 CERTIFIED

 Copies of the foregoing Mailed or delivered to:

21 Robert Kamman, Esq. 7840 N. 31st Ave., #103 Phoenix, Arizona 85051

Christine Cassetta
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division, Tax Section
1275 West Washington Street

24 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

25