1	COURT OF APPEALS
2	STATE OF NEW YORK
3	
4	MATTER OF GAIED,
5	Appellant,
6	-against- No. 26
7	NO. 20 NEW YORK STATE TAX APPEALS TRIBUNAL,
8	Respondent.
9	
10	20 Eagle Street Albany, New York 12207 January 16, 2014
11	
12	Before:
13	CHIEF JUDGE JONATHAN LIPPMAN ASSOCIATE JUDGE VICTORIA A. GRAFFEO
14	ASSOCIATE JUDGE SUSAN PHILLIPS READ ASSOCIATE JUDGE ROBERT S. SMITH
15	ASSOCIATE JUDGE EUGENE F. PIGOTT, JR. ASSOCIATE JUDGE JENNY RIVERA
16	ASSOCIATE JUDGE SHEILA ABDUS-SALAAM
17	Appearances:
18	TIMOTHY P. NOONAN, ESQ. HODGSON RUSS LLP
19	Attorneys for Appellant 140 Pearl Street, Suite 100
20	Buffalo, NY 14202
21	ROBERT M. GOLDFARB, ASG STATE OF NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
22	Attorneys for Respondent The Capitol
23	Albany, NY 12224
24	
25	Karen Schiffmiller Official Court Transcriber

1	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Number 26, the Matter
2	of John Gaied v. New York Tax Appeal Tribunal.
3	Counselor, do you want any rebuttal time?
4	MR. NOONAN: Yes, Judge, two minutes?
5	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Two minutes, sure, go
6	ahead. You're on.
7	MR. NOONAN: May it please the court, my
8	name is Timothy Noonan, counsel for Mr. Gaied in this
9	case.
10	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: [Gay-ed], excuse me.
11	MR. NOONAN: [Gay-ed].
12	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay, keep going.
13	MR. NOONAN: Your Honors, this is a case
14	involving New York's residency rules, and one that
15	has struck a chord, because of the unusual results it
16	creates. It the result is a taxpayer a
17	New Jersey taxpayer, who doesn't live or reside in
18	New York, is being taxed as a New York resident for
19	tax purposes.
20	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Counsel
21	JUDGE READ: But he does own the he
22	does own the property?
23	MR. NOONAN: He does own the property.
24	JUDGE READ: Isn't that enough?
25	MR. NOONAN: It is not enough, Judge, under

1 our view. 2 JUDGE READ: Why not? 3 MR. NOONAN: Well, under our view, Judge, the standard that was set forth - - - and it's on 4 5 page 61 to 64 of the record - - - the test we think you should apply, Judge, is the test that was applied 6 7 first by the Tax Appeals Tribunal in this case in its first decision. 8 9 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: What's the 10 significance apropos what Judge Read is asking you, 11 that it's in his name; it's clearly his house; he 12 owns it. 13 MR. NOONAN: Sure, Judge. The - - - the significance is there's two factors. The test is 14 15 whether or not he's maintaining a permanent place of 16 abode. One factor is maintenance, and again this is 17 the test set forth by the - - -18 JUDGE SMITH: Well, if the question is - -19 JUDGE GRAFFEO: Is this the administrative 20 21 law judge decision - - -22 MR. NOONAN: No - - -23 JUDGE GRAFFEO: - - - that you're talking 2.4 about? 25 MR. NOONAN: - - - it's the Tax Appeals

Tribunal decision that was initially in favor. 1 JUDGE GRAFFEO: The first - - - the first 2 Tribunal decision. 3 MR. NOONAN: The first Tribunal decision. 4 5 So I started answering the question. So the question of whether or not someone owns it is relevant to the 6 7 question of maintenance. Do they, you know, pay the 8 living expenses? Do they do what's necessary to - -9 10 JUDGE SMITH: Is the question really 11 whether he "maintains" a place of abode means maintains it for himself? 12 13 MR. NOONAN: Judge, I think so. I mean, 14 and it gets to the second prong of the test, and 15 that's the prong of the test that, again, the first tribunal also laid out, which was that the - - - the 16 17 abode also has to be a permanent place of abode. JUDGE READ: Well, what - - -18 19 JUDGE GRAFFEO: What if you own two or 20 three properties and you stay regularly in each one. 21 Would that still - - -22 MR. NOONAN: That would count - - -23 JUDGE GRAFFEO: - - - meet your test as a 24 statutory resident? 25 MR. NOONAN: Sure, yes. Under - - - under

1 that test, if someone - - - I mean, under - - -2 again, the view set forth by the first Tribunal, the 3 permanent place of abode test looks to whether - - -4 looks to two things: does the taxpayer - - - well, 5 what are the physical attributes of the dwelling, and 6 how does the taxpayer use the dwelling? 7 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: What - - - what about 8 in this case where your immediate family lives there? 9 MR. NOONAN: Well, the - - - the question 10 is - - -11 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Your parents live 12 there - -13 MR. NOONAN: Right. 14 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: - - - you go to see 15 them all the time. Taking care of them in the best -16 - - best sense of that. Can't be if you don't sleep 17 there on a regular basis, no good? 18 MR. NOONAN: No good, Judge, because the 19 question again is whether this taxpayer is resident. 20 The test is, do they maintain a permanent place of 21 abode? A place of abode is a dwelling place. New 22 York tax regulations describe it as a dwelling. 23 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: If he lived there 24 before, and then left, and he's left with this 25 arrangement where he goes and takes care of his

1 parents. That's okay, right? That's - - - that's - - - I'm 2 MR. NOONAN: 3 not sure, Judge; those aren't our facts. 4 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: It would probably - -5 - but he kept his residence even though he doesn't 6 live there anymore? 7 MR. NOONAN: Well, the question is, does he maintain living arrangements for himself in a 8 9 dwelling place sufficient to tax him as a resident? 10 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And - - -11 JUDGE GRAFFEO: And what does this record 12 tell us? Does he spend overnights there on a regular 13 basis? The record tells us that once 14 MR. NOONAN: 15 every one or two months, he stayed overnight there when his parents asked him. That's clear in the 16 17 record. JUDGE PIGOTT: We're stuck - - - we're 18 19 stuck with the facts as - - - as you were about to 20 outline. I take it you - - - you prefer the 21 rationale of the dissent in the - - - in the 22 Appellate Division. 23 MR. NOONAN: I like the rationale of the 24 dissent, yes, Judge. 25 JUDGE PIGOTT: Is it - - - does it address

б

1	it completely for you, or is there something you
2	would add?
3	MR. NOONAN: Well, the I guess, it
4	does address it completely, and then it gets right to
5	the point. And the point the dissenters get to is
6	that the reason we have this residency statute
7	it looks to the legislative history. Why is it here?
8	It's here to tax someone who really is a resident of
9	New York.
10	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Is it hard, though,
11	to do this this to get into the subject
12	of use? Do you got to draw lines that are so hard to
13	do, or do you look at, again, the ownership, you
14	know, he's he's very familiar with his place,
15	and and you don't try and parse that, or do you
16	have to, in the interest of what you're saying?
17	MR. NOONAN: Judge, I think that
18	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You don't really live
19	there. End of story. Bottom line.
20	MR. NOONAN: Judge, I think you do have to,
21	because, again, we're this is a residency
22	statute. Residency is facts and circumstances in any
23	context. So to have a black-and-white rule is not
24	consistent with residency.
25	Again, going back, this court in 1998 in

the Tamagni case - - - again, this court hasn't 1 2 interpreted the phrase "permanent place of abode" 3 yet, but in the Tamagni case, this court looked at 4 the reason why we have this statutory residency 5 provision. And it said - - - and there's legislative 6 7 history right in the decision where the Tax 8 Department went to the legislature and said, look, we 9 have cases of millionaires who spend ten months of 10 the year in their homes in New York, and yet they're 11 able to avoid taxation, because they - - - they claim a domicile elsewhere. 12 13 So what this court said, and what the - - what the legislature said back then is, this is to 14 15 get at folks who really are residents, but yet 16 they're able to claim domicile somewhere else, so 17 they're not paying tax - - -JUDGE GRAFFEO: What's our standard of 18 19 Isn't this a substantial evidence case? review? 20 MR. NOONAN: Judge, it's not. It's - - -21 we need to get the standard right. The - - - the Tax 22 Appeals Tribunal applied the standard that's been 23 applied for twenty years, and that standard is 24 looking to the legislative history - - - looking to 25 the intent behind statutory residency. Does a

1 taxpayer have to have living arrangements in a 2 dwelling - - -3 JUDGE GRAFFEO: Well, that's - - - that's the Tribunal, but what's our standard of review of 4 5 their decision? MR. NOONAN: Of the Tribunal's decision? 6 7 JUDGE GRAFFEO: Yes. 8 MR. NOONAN: Yeah, I think the - - - the -9 10 JUDGE GRAFFEO: Isn't it - - - isn't it 11 substantial evidence? MR. NOONAN: Well, Judge, what happened - -12 13 - I - - no - - - Judge, I don't think so. I think 14 what happened is, there was the initial Gaied 15 decision, where they decided in favor of Mr. Gaied 16 and applied the test, we think - - - we're asking 17 this court to apply. Then there was a second decision that applied a different test. That was the 18 wrong test. We have to get this test - - -19 20 JUDGE SMITH: So you're saying - - - you're 21 22 JUDGE GRAFFEO: You want us to examine the 23 test itself. 24 MR. NOONAN: You have to get the test right 25 first, and then, Judge, after that, it'll be easy. I

1	mean
2	JUDGE SMITH: You you say it's a pure
3	question of law, then. There are no facts in
4	dispute.
5	MR. NOONAN: I do Judge, agreed. If
6	if you side with the respondent's view, we
7	concede we lose. The respondent says you don't need
8	to dwell in the abode; you only need to maintain it.
9	We say that's inconsistent with residency. If you
10	apply the test we're advocating, again, I the
11	test the initial tribunal applied, the we're
12	fine, because the initial tribunal already applied
13	the facts of this case.
14	JUDGE SMITH: Now, under under
15	as you read the Tribunal's decision, would it matter
16	if Mr. Gaied never spent overnight at his parent's
17	house? Would that change the result?
18	MR. NOONAN: No, it wouldn't matter.
19	JUDGE SMITH: And this on their
20	on their rationale, could this house be in Buffalo?
21	MR. NOONAN: Sure, yeah. And, Judge, I
22	mean
23	JUDGE SMITH: And then then
24	he'd be a New York resident because he because
25	he owned and maintained it.

1	MR. NOONAN: Correct, yes. That's
2	that's how that's, you know, how far this
3	interpretation by respondent goes, that no one needs
4	to dwell
5	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: What if you're
6	closer, if you're not in Buffalo? If you're twenty-
7	some-odd miles away miles away, makes a little
8	more difficult to
9	MR. NOONAN: Yeah.
10	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: to make that
11	kind of if you're in Buffalo, well, you know, I
12	think it's a pretty obvious case.
13	MR. NOONAN: And Judge, you're performing
14	exactly the type of facts and circumstances inquiry
15	that we're saying is required here. That you do
16	actually have to look at whether the taxpayer
17	maintains living arrangements in the dwelling.
18	JUDGE GRAFFEO: Well, what was the
19	renovation of the basement for? Was he making an
20	apartment for himself?
21	MR. NOONAN: He was making an apartment for
22	himself. So as the record reflects in 2000 at
23	the end of 2003, early 2004, he had he had a -
24	a different tax issue. He needed to come up with
25	some funds. So he had to sell his New Jersey house,

and actually the first Tribunal noted this as a 1 positive fact. He didn't move into his parent's 2 3 apartment. He didn't move into one of the other 4 apartments. He created a separate apartment in the 5 basement by building a wall - - -CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: This was after the 6 7 tax period in question? MR. NOONAN: After the tax period in 8 9 question, yes, Judge. 10 JUDGE SMITH: And he - - - and he - - - he admits that he became a resident in 2 - - -11 12 MR. NOONAN: He's filed as a resident since 13 2004. JUDGE SMITH: - - - since 2004. 14 15 MR. NOONAN: Correct, Judge. 16 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay, counsel. 17 You'll have your rebuttal time. 18 MR. NOONAN: Thank you, Judge. 19 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let's see what your adversary has to say. 20 21 MR. GOLDFARB: Good afternoon. May it 22 please the court, this case came down to the weight 23 of the evidence and credibility determinations. 24 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Counsel, let me ask 25 you a question. As - - - as I understand the - - -

1 the law here, if you spent 182 days in New York and 2 you didn't have a permanent place of abode, you don't 3 have to pay the - - - the taxes? 4 MR. GOLDFARB: You would not be deemed a 5 statutory resident. 6 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: So - - - so what's 7 the fairness? In this case, we have a guy who, by 8 any standard, doesn't really live there, certainly 9 not on any kind of a regular basis. And he has to 10 pay taxes, but the guy who's there 182 - - - because 11 he owns, in name, the building. But the guy who 12 spends 182 days - - - or the person, and - - - and 13 doesn't own a place, doesn't pay taxes? Does that 14 seem fair to you? 15 MR. GOLDFARB: Your Honor, this is a 16 statute that's designed to prevent tax evasion. And 17 the legislature enacted what was - - -18 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: But there's got to be 19 some - - -20 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - purely an objective 21 test. 22 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: There's got to - - -23 excuse me. There's got to be some rhyme and reason 24 to it. And what I'm saying to you - - - what makes 25 sense is, if you don't really reside there, that's

1 the ultimate test, and no one who actually resides should have to - - - who doesn't actually reside - -2 3 - I can make sense of the statute if that's the test. 4 But if you're telling me that you have two 5 people who don't reside there, and one spends 182 days there, but doesn't own a place, and the other 6 7 one, you know, owns a place, but doesn't spend near 8 as much time or whatever it is, you know - - - you 9 follow what I'm saying? 10 MR. GOLDFARB: I follow you, Your Honor. 11 Let's - - - the plain language of the statute 12 requires only that the taxpayer - - -13 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: It doesn't - - doesn't matter - - -14 15 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - maintain - - -16 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: - - - whether it's 17 fair? Yeah, go ahead. MR. GOLDFARB: Well, fairness needs to be 18 19 addressed to the legislature. The statute only 20 requires that the taxpayer maintain the abode and 21 that it be available - - -22 JUDGE SMITH: Does have to be, in your view 23 2.4 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - for his use. 25 JUDGE SMITH: In your view, does it not

1 matter whose abode it is as long as he maintains it? MR. GOLDFARB: It - - - it - - - it matters 2 3 if it is available for his use. And he failed to 4 prove that these three apartments were unavailable 5 for his use during this audit period. 6 JUDGE SMITH: But you - - - but you say it 7 is - - - it is essential that it be available for his 8 use? 9 MR. GOLDFARB: Yes, the - - - the - - -10 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Even if - - - even if 11 12 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - the Department - - -13 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Even if he never uses 14 it? 15 MR. GOLDFARB: Yes, the Department and the 16 Tribunal have reasonably - - -17 JUDGE SMITH: So if he - - - if he - - - if 18 he never spent a night in this house, it would make 19 him a New York resident? 20 MR. GOLDFARB: If it was available for his 21 use and - - -22 JUDGE RIVERA: So - - -23 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - he could not establish 24 to the contrary. 25 JUDGE RIVERA: So - - - so if - - - if I

1 buy a home for my elderly parent - - - I - - - I live 2 in New Jersey. I buy a home for my elderly parents 3 in the Bronx, and I visit them 183 days. I never 4 stay in that home. I stay somewhere else. I've got 5 to pay the tax? MR. GOLDFARB: No, if you can establish 6 7 that you have maintained that property - - -JUDGE RIVERA: Yeah. 8 9 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - exclusively for your 10 parents' use, this statute will not apply. JUDGE SMITH: But if Tribunal - - -11 12 JUDGE RIVERA: So how would I do that? 13 MR. GOLDFARB: But the Tribunal reasonably 14 found that petitioner did not establish that. 15 JUDGE SMITH: But if - - - but if Judge Rivera - - - if Judge Rivera's parents say you're 16 17 welcome to stay overnight anytime you want, even if she never stays, then she's a resident? 18 19 MR. GOLDFARB: Not necessarily, Your Honor. 20 This is weighing of the fact - - -21 JUDGE SMITH: You're saying if it's 22 available to you - - -23 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - we have more than that 2.4 here. 25 JUDGE SMITH: If she maintains the place,

1 it's available for her - - - for her use, what's - -2 - what's missing? 3 MR. GOLDFARB: Well, the - - - that would be a facts and circumstances that could be weighed by 4 5 the Tribunal, but we - - -6 JUDGE SMITH: Now - - - now suppose - - -7 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - have more here. 8 JUDGE SMITH: Suppose the Tribunal weighs 9 it against her, then you're saying she could be found to be a resident. 10 11 MR. GOLDFARB: I don't think the mere fact 12 that you would stay overnight with your parents would 13 be sufficient here, but we have much more - - -JUDGE SMITH: Well, you have - - -14 15 JUDGE RIVERA: That would be - - -16 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - and I'd like to say 17 what that is. The Tribunal found he had keys; he had unfettered access to the property, explicitly 18 19 rejecting his credibility on this. 20 JUDGE RIVERA: Except he says it's an 21 investment property. 22 MR. GOLDFARB: He says that. 23 JUDGE RIVERA: One would hope the landlord 2.4 would have keys. 25 MR. GOLDFARB: Yes, that was only one

1 factor. Petitioner used the property as his mailing 2 address on a number of documents during the audit 3 period. 4 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: So in Judge Rivera's 5 example, she owns the building. Her parents live - -6 - live there. And there might be space for her, and 7 they say, you can stay over; as long as she doesn't 8 use it as her mailing address, or what else - - -9 MR. GOLDFARB: Well, he was - - -10 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: - - - would that be 11 her - - -12 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - also registered to 13 vote in New York during the years in issue. He had telephone and utilities billed in his name at this 14 15 property. He stayed overnight at the property 16 repeatedly throughout the audit period. And I think 17 that the Tribunal was all - - -CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: But the Tribunal's 18 19 decision says, we don't even get into subject of use. 20 The things that you're talking about are enough. Do 21 you buy that? That - - - that - - - I thought you 22 just said if he never uses it, you know, or never has 23 any connection to it, he can avoid the tax. In other 24 words, if he never use - - -25 MR. GOLDFARB: If he has no connection to

it, certainly, Your Honor.

_	
2	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: They say no.
3	He owns the building; he, whatever it is he has
4	the mailbox in his name or whatever it might be, but
5	he never, ever stays there, you know, never even a
6	hint that he stays there. Does he pay tax or not?
7	MR. GOLDFARB: Yes, because if he has a
8	mailbox
9	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: So you don't
10	MR. GOLDFARB: in his name there, it
11	is not exclusively for
12	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Then you you -
13	you don't look at at at the
14	subjective use as the Tribunal
15	MR. GOLDFARB: Well, you
16	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: that's your
17	- that's the test, and where you disagree with your
18	adversary is he says that's the wrong test.
19	MR. GOLDFARB: Well, the statute clearly
20	sets forth an objective test. It's says you're in
21	for over half the year in the state, physically
22	present. You make
23	JUDGE SMITH: But you say by
24	objective you mean that anyone can it's a
25	clear, bright line that anyone can figure out?

1 MR. GOLDFARB: Well, that's right, and - -2 3 JUDGE SMITH: Because a minute ago, you told me there were facts and circumstances the 4 5 Tribunal could weigh, when I was asking about Judge Rivera's case. 6 7 MR. GOLDFARB: The Tribunal can weigh facts 8 and circumstances to see whether the taxpayer has 9 satisfied his burden to establish that this property 10 was maintained exclusively for the use of third 11 parties. 12 JUDGE PIGOTT: Do you agree with Mr. 13 Noonan's statements about what the purpose of this statute is when it was first enacted, and as outlined 14 15 in Tamagni? 16 MR. GOLDFARB: Yes, I do, and that's what 17 the court said in Tamagni. You're - - - you're 18 really trying to get people who are residents - - -19 JUDGE PIGOTT: That are living outside the 20 state and you want to make sure that they're - - -21 that they're paying their New York taxes. 22 MR. GOLDFARB: That's right, but the - - -23 JUDGE PIGOTT: Does this appear to you to 24 be the reverse now? Where there are people who are 25 actually living in another state, you know, who are

doing things like this, and that's kind of the - - -1 2 it seems to me it's kind of the inverse of what the 3 original intent was. MR. GOLDFARB: Well, that - - - that's an 4 5 argument that can be made to the legislature. This -6 7 JUDGE PIGOTT: Why? If - - - if that's the intent of the statute and we agree that that's the 8 9 intent of the statute, why do we have to go to the 10 legislature? We say they did it right, and you're 11 interpreting the law wrong. MR. GOLDFARB: Because the - - - the - - -12 13 the legislature furthered that intent by enacting a simple objective test. If you're in the state for 14 15 over 183 days, you maintain a place of abode here, 16 you're going to be deemed a statutory resident - - -17 JUDGE SMITH: Even if - - - even if - - even if he maintains - - -18 19 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - regardless of the 20 extent of your use. 21 JUDGE SMITH: Even if he maintains someone 22 else's abode, not your own? Isn't - - - isn't - - -23 isn't more likely that the legislature meant if you 24 maintain a place of abode for yourself? MR. GOLDFARB: Well, I think a reasonable 25

1 inference here is that it was maintained, at least in 2 part, to be available for his use. I think the 3 Tribunal was entitled to - - -4 JUDGE SMITH: No, well, you're - - - you're 5 - - - you're really saying that on this record, part 6 of the - - - a - - - even any part of the purpose of 7 having that place was to give him a place to sleep? 8 It doesn't look that way to me. 9 MR. GOLDFARB: Well - - -10 JUDGE SMITH: And he - - - he - - - he says he hated sleeping there. He only did it when his 11 12 parents begged him, and then he slept on the couch. 13 MR. GOLDFARB: He did say that, but the Tribunal rejected his credibility on certain issues. 14 15 JUDGE SMITH: I know - - - well, they 16 didn't - - - they - - - they have - - - it's not just 17 credibility. They have E-ZPass records. He went to 18 a lot of trouble to go home to New Jersey every 19 night, when he could have been going - - - going to 20 this nearby place. 21 MR. GOLDFARB: But the fact is - - -22 JUDGE SMITH: You're - - - you're saying 23 this was his home? This was a place of abode for 2.4 him? 25 MR. GOLDFARB: It doesn't have to be his -

1	his home necessarily. That statute
2	JUDGE SMITH: It has to be his it has
3	to be his residence, doesn't it?
4	MR. GOLDFARB: But the statute contemplates
5	that this taxpayer is going to have more than one
6	residence. And it clearly
7	JUDGE SMITH: Yeah, well, so many
8	taxpayers do. But is this really a guy with two
9	houses and this is this is just this was
10	his pied-a-tier in on Staten Island?
11	MR. GOLDFARB: The fact is we really don't
12	know because he didn't satisfy his burden of proof.
13	There were three apartments here; each one could
14	qualify as a permanent place of abode under the
15	statute. His evidence of rental of the two
16	apartments that his parents were not in was sketchy
17	at best. And
18	JUDGE RIVERA: And does it matter if the -
19	if the place of abode is for commercial purposes?
20	He said he he bought it for an investment.
21	MR. GOLDFARB: If if if he had
22	established that with clear and convincing evidence,
23	he he could have escaped this statute, but
24	_
25	JUDGE RIVERA: He paid

1 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - based on this record -2 3 JUDGE RIVERA: He paid taxes for it as an investment, did he not? 4 5 MR. GOLDFARB: He - - -JUDGE RIVERA: Did he list it as an 6 7 investment on his taxes, as a commercial property that he owned? 8 9 MR. GOLDFARB: He did list it, but as a 10 matter of fact, he had no underlying books or records 11 12 JUDGE SMITH: But are you say - - -13 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - to substantiate - - -JUDGE SMITH: Did the Tribunal find - - -14 15 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - rental income or 16 expenses. 17 JUDGE SMITH: Did the Tribunal find he was 18 not really renting out those apartments? That this 19 was all a fraud? That he was using them for his own 20 purpose? 21 MR. GOLDFARB: Well, they - - - they did 22 not find fraud. 23 JUDGE SMITH: Then what's - - - what's - -24 25 MR. GOLDFARB: What they found was - - -

JUDGE SMITH: What's the relevance of the 1 sketchiness of the records, if - - - if everyone 2 3 agrees there were tenants in there? 4 MR. GOLDFARB: Everyone does not agree that 5 there were - - -6 JUDGE SMITH: You say there weren't? 7 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - that there were tenants in there. 8 9 JUDGE SMITH: But you - - - you - - - you -10 11 MR. GOLDFARB: He has proof that these 12 rented to third parties was entirely deficient. 13 JUDGE SMITH: So you're saying - - - you're saying that on this record, the Tribunal could find 14 15 or did find or he failed to disprove that these were empty spaces he was keeping there for when he wanted 16 17 to sleep there? 18 MR. GOLDFARB: He failed to disprove that 19 these apartments were unavailable for his use during 20 this period. 21 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Why, because he had -22 23 MR. GOLDFARB: He had other family members 24 staying there rent free - - -25 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Why, because he had

1 keys to them? Is that the key to this? If he has 2 access to the keys, then that shows that - - - that 3 it's - - -MR. GOLDFARB: That's not determinative - -4 5 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: - - - it could be for 6 7 his use - - -8 MR. GOLDFARB: That's certainly one factor 9 that the Tribunal weighed against him. But he also 10 used it as a mailing address. He was registered to 11 vote - - -CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: But isn't it likely 12 13 that he would - - -14 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - during the years in 15 New York. 16 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: - - - if he owns it 17 and his elderly parents are the - - - the ones who he 18 bought it for? Isn't it likely he would use his 19 address and - - -20 MR. GOLDFARB: That's a matter for the 21 Tribunal in weighing that evidence. But they also 22 had other evidence here that he was using it as a 23 mailing address - - -24 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You don't agree that 25 - - - you don't agree that this is a matter of law?

1 MR. GOLDFARB: I - - - I think that the 2 legal question here is just whether there is 3 substantial evidence to support the Tribunal's determination that he maintained three permanent 4 5 places of abode - - -6 JUDGE SMITH: I'm - - - I'm sensing a 7 disconnect. 8 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - that were available 9 for his use. 10 JUDGE SMITH: The problem I'm - - - one of 11 the problems I'm having is you - - - you seem to say 12 this is a simple, objective test that - - - that the 13 legislature wasn't worried about fairness. They were 14 worried about drawing a nice, clear objective line, 15 but when we press you about the facts, you 16 essentially say the Tribunal can come out any way it 17 wants. 18 MR. GOLDFARB: The - - - the statute 19 contains an objective presumption, essentially. That 20 it presumes if you maintain the abode, and you're - -21 - that it is available for your use, the Department 22 and the Tribunal have reasonably interpreted - - -23 JUDGE SMITH: Where - - - where does the 24 statute - - -25 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - the statute - - -

1 JUDGE SMITH: Where does the statute say 2 available for your use? 3 MR. GOLDFARB: It doesn't. That's a 4 reasonable - - -5 JUDGE SMITH: And it says - - - it says, "maintains an abode". Doesn't that have to mean 6 7 either one of two things: either your abode or 8 anyone's abode? 9 MR. GOLDFARB: It - - - it - - - it has to 10 mean an abode - - - I think it was intended to mean 11 an abode that is available for your use. 12 JUDGE PIGOTT: But it just doesn't - - - it 13 doesn't make sense. It - - - it reads like if you 14 intend to live in New York, we want to tax you. All 15 right. But - - - but that - - - that - - - it doesn't follow that if - - - that if - - - if 16 17 somebody buys a house for their parents and leaves it in their - - - in their name, that that's creating an 18 19 abode for their use. 20 MR. GOLDFARB: And I'm not contending that 21 here. If - - - if petition - - - if the - - - if the facts and circumstances had indicated that this 22 23 property was maintained solely for - - - exclusively 24 for his parents' use. But it wasn't. 25 JUDGE PIGOTT: Well, why did you get in so

1 much trouble with - - - with Judge Rivera's question 2 about having - - - you know, having your parents in a 3 home and just visiting them from time to time that 4 you seem to think that - - - you know, you're going 5 to be taxed as a New York resident for that. MR. GOLDFARB: No, I - - - I - - - I'm 6 7 sorry if - - - if - - - if I indicated that. I did 8 not mean that. 9 JUDGE SMITH: Well, I think you said - - -10 you said if you added the fact that she's welcomed to 11 stay overnight, even if she doesn't, you said that 12 might do it for - - -13 MR. GOLDFARB: No, I - - - I don't think 14 The mere fact that you stay - - - children stay so. 15 overnight with parents. But we have a lot more here. 16 If I can just mention that - - -17 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay - - -JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Well, the lot more - -18 19 - the only thing that you're saying that I think is 20 distinguishable from the situation where Judge Rivera 21 was talking about is he has a voting - - - he's 22 maintained that address as a voting residence, 23 because if he owns the building and his - - - his 24 parents are elderly, he doesn't want the bills for 25 the building coming to his parents, who may not be

1 able to deal with them, so he uses the - - - his - -2 - that as his mailing address to get bills for that 3 building. MR. GOLDFARB: Well, before I sit down, let 4 5 me at least say what more we have, besides that. 6 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Fi - - - go ahead. 7 MR. GOLDFARB: We have - - -8 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Finish, counsel. Go 9 ahead. 10 MR. GOLDFARB: Thank you. We - - - we have 11 - - - he - - - he had free, unfettered access. He -12 - - he used it as his mailing address. He was 13 registered to vote. He stayed overnight at the 14 property on many occasions. And I think that the 15 Tribunal was also entitled to attach significance to 16 the fact that this property was only two miles from 17 his twenty-four hour business in New York, where he 18 was called upon to be day and night - - -19 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: If he stayed over - -20 21 MR. GOLDFARB: - - - and that justified an 22 inference that - - -23 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: If he stayed over 24 once or twice a month, is that your many times? 25 That's enough?

1 MR. GOLDFARB: It was repeatedly throughout 2 the years, but again, actually use is not required, 3 but - - -4 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: But repeatedly - - -5 assume it's once or twice a month. Enough? MR. GOLDFARB: It's enough. In fact, it's 6 7 not - - - not required. It's just required that he maintain an abode - - -8 9 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay, thank you, 10 counsel. MR. GOLDFARB: - - - available for his use. 11 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let's hear from - - -12 13 MR. GOLDFARB: Thank you. CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: - - - the rebuttal 14 15 from your adversary. 16 MR. NOONAN: Judge, Mr. Goldfarb makes a 17 lot of the facts here, that if you just look at the facts. He wants to get out his facts. The Tribunal 18 19 20 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: He says there's 21 support in the record for what they found. You're 22 saying the test is wrong. Is that your argument? 23 MR. NOONAN: The test is wrong, Judge. 24 When - - - when - - - when it's - - - the Tribunal 25 set forth the test that does require living

1 arrangements, which many of your questions to Mr. 2 Goldfarb suggest might be the test, the Tribunal 3 applied that test, and then applied it to the facts and came out in favor of Mr. Gaied. That - - -4 5 JUDGE PIGOTT: One of the troubling things 6 here is that voting that - - - that Mr. Goldfarb 7 brings up. I mean, you're supposed to - - - you're 8 supposed to live in New York to vote in New York, and 9 10 MR. NOONAN: I understand, Judge. He - - -11 JUDGE PIGOTT: How does that get explained? 12 MR. NOONAN: He - - - he used to live in 13 New York in the early 1990s, and he moved. And like 14 many people who move, he didn't change his voting. 15 And in fact, if you look at the record, the address that's used in - - - for his voting registration in 16 these years was his old address in Staten Island. So 17 18 he wasn't - - -19 JUDGE PIGOTT: Oh, so you're saying he 20 didn't vote; he was just registered to vote. 21 I think he voted in the year MR. NOONAN: 22 2000, before - - - not in these audit years. 23 JUDGE SMITH: But he - - - so he wasn't 2.4 registered from the place of abode? 25 MR. NOONAN: Correct, he wasn't registered

1	from the MacFarland Avenue address. He was
2	registered from his old address.
3	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: So what do you say?
4	The test, you say, is what? That it should be a
5	subjective test, not a objective test, or
6	MR. NOONAN: The test is, in order to
7	determine whether or not an abode is is a
8	permanent place of abode, a permanent dwelling place,
9	you need to take into account both the physical
10	attributes of the place and the taxpayer's usage of
11	the place, whether or not the taxpayer's living
12	there. And Judges, that's been the test in New York
13	for twenty-some years
14	JUDGE PIGOTT: Does that mean that this
15	- if we were to agree to you, it has to go back?
16	MR. NOONAN: Judge, I don't think so,
17	because Gaied the first Tribunal in Gaied
18	already applied the already applied that test.
19	Really, I think, Judge, the answer is if you agree
20	with me, you annul the Tribunal's second
21	determination, because what the Tribunal took the
22	very unusual step in thirty in twenty-some
23	years of the Tax Appeals Tribunal existing, they've
24	only granted two of the arguments
25	JUDGE RIVERA: So how much so

1	MR. NOONAN: they they change -
2	they reversed the argument.
3	JUDGE RIVERA: So how much how much -
4	
5	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: The reargument was
6	granted after the Appellate Division
7	MR. NOONAN: No, Judge, that reargument was
8	granted after their first decision. So the the
9	procedure was it was first Tribunal decision
10	where they found in favor of Mr. Gaied
11	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: And what prompted
12	that, as far as you know?
13	MR. NOONAN: The Tax Department made a
14	motion to to reargue and their basis for
15	rearguing was you got the standard wrong. Not that
16	you missed all these facts; that you got the standard
17	wrong.
18	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: You say that they
19	were wrong in saying the standard that they changed
20	to was wrong.
21	MR. NOONAN: The standard was right.
22	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Judge Rivera, go
23	ahead.
24	JUDGE RIVERA: So how much you
25	mentioned the second prong being the use of the

1	place. Why why can't they conclude that this
2	particular use satisfies your standard?
3	MR. NOONAN: Well, that's that's the
4	that's the facts and circumstances you
5	you know, we have to look at some whether
6	someone really lives here. That's one what residency
7	is in the first place, anyways.
8	This court, a couple of months ago, in a -
9	a pistol-permit case, talked about residency.
10	And and residency being, you know, someone
11	- it's not the same as domicile, where someone has a
12	permanent and primary home, but residency at least
13	means some substantial connection evidenced by you
14	living somewhere
15	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Your interpretation
16	of the statutory language is that it means you really
17	live here.
18	MR. NOONAN: Yeah, not as a as a
19	resident.
20	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yeah, I understand.
21	MR. NOONAN: Yeah, yes.
22	JUDGE GRAFFEO: Did you
23	CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's basically what
24	you say the test you interpret the statute to
25	be if you really live here, you get taxed.

1 While your adversary, I think, is arguing, if you 2 maintain a place that you could conceivably use, you 3 have to pay the tax. 4 MR. NOONAN: Yes, Judge, and I - - - we 5 believe - - -6 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: That - - -7 MR. NOONAN: - - - that's the exact 8 dichotomy and we - - -9 JUDGE RIVERA: So let me ask you a 10 question, going back to my hypothetical. 11 MR. NOONAN: Sure. 12 JUDGE RIVERA: So I buy that house for the 13 elderly parents in the Bronx. I have a - - - an 14 actual room in that house that is designated for me. 15 My name is on the outside, but - - - and I want to 16 stay there. I desire to stay there. But I'm so busy 17 - - - remember, I said I live in Jersey - - - in 18 Jersey that I never actually am able to stay at all 19 in that room overnight. Taxed or not taxed? 20 MR. NOONAN: You're not taxed. You're not 21 22 JUDGE RIVERA: I'm not? 23 MR. NOONAN: You're not taxed, because - -2.4 25 JUDGE RIVERA: Because I never stayed, even

though that's what I intended when I bought it, and 1 2 my parents understand that. My name is on the door. 3 MR. NOONAN: Residency is where you live. It's living there. In the - - -4 5 JUDGE RIVERA: It doesn't say "live"? MR. NOONAN: What's that? 6 7 JUDGE RIVERA: Does the statute say "live"? 8 MR. NOONAN: The statute says a permanent 9 place of abode. 10 JUDGE RIVERA: I maintain - - - does it say 11 I have to actually stay there? 12 MR. NOONAN: No, it's two tests. 13 JUDGE RIVERA: I mean, that's the point, 14 right? 15 MR. NOONAN: It's "maintain" and a 16 permanent place of abode. And an abode is a dwelling 17 place. You have to dwell there; you have to live 18 there. 19 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: But - - - but does it 20 have to be for you? Or can it be for someone - - -21 MR. NOONAN: Absolutely, Judge, it has to 22 be for you. 23 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: - - - like your 24 parents or your wife or your child? You know, your 25 child's away at school, you buy a house or an

apartment for the child. 1 MR. NOONAN: Judge, it has to be for you. 2 3 It - - - I mean - - -4 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: It has to be you - - -5 not - - -MR. NOONAN: - - - this - - - this is 6 7 residency - - -8 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: - - - not somebody - -9 10 MR. NOONAN: Not somebody else, because 11 we're talking about taxing a person on all of their 12 income - - - even though they pay tax in another 13 state, taxing them on all their income in this state too. Looking to the legislative history: why do we 14 15 have this in the first place? It's to tax people who really are residents - - -16 17 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay, counsel, 18 thanks. 19 MR. NOONAN: Thank you. 20 CHIEF JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you both. 21 Appreciate it. 22 (Court is adjourned) 23 24 25

1	
2	CERTIFICATION
3	
4	I, Karen Schiffmiller, certify that the
5	foregoing transcript of proceedings in the Court of
6	Appeals of Matter of Gaied v New York State Tax
7	Appeals Tribunal, No. 26 was prepared using the
8	required transcription equipment and is a true and
9	accurate record of the proceedings.
10	
11	2 1111. 11.
12	Hour Schoffmille.
13	Signature:
14	
15	Agency Name: eScribers
16	
17	Address of Agency: 700 West 192nd Street
18	Suite # 607
19	New York, NY 10040
20	
21	Date: January 24, 2014
22	
23	
24	
25	