

Corporate taxpayer was entitled to credit for corporate income tax paid in another state. *Kettler Realty Corp. v. Director, Div. of Taxation*, 12 N.J.Tax 470 (1992), affirmed 14 N.J.Tax 165.

Net worth determination that did not result in unfair or unreasonable tax would not be modified on judicial review. *Kettler Realty Corp. v. Director, Div. of Taxation*, 12 N.J.Tax 470 (1992), affirmed 14 N.J.Tax 165.

Interpretation of amendment to corporate tax governing safe harbor leasing provisions did not constitute rulemaking. *Reuben H. Donnelley Corp. v. New Jersey Dept. of Treasury, Div. of Taxation*, 11 N.J.Tax 241 (1990), reversed 12 N.J.Tax 255, certification granted 127 N.J. 551, 606 A.2d 364, reversed 128 N.J. 218, 607 A.2d 1281.

Corporate owner of safe harbor leased property could include the property in the business allocation factor. *Reuben H. Donnelley Corp. v. New Jersey Dept. of Treasury, Div. of Taxation*, 11 N.J.Tax 241 (1990), reversed 12 N.J.Tax 255, certification granted 127 N.J. 551, 606 A.2d 364, reversed 128 N.J. 218, 607 A.2d 1281.

18:7-8.2 Method of arithmetic computation required

In computing allocation percentages, division must be carried to six decimal places, for example .201614 or 20.1614 per cent.

Statutory References

N.J.S.A. 54:10A-8.

18:7-8.3 Right of Director to independently compute allocation factor

(a) If it appears that the business allocation factor computed on the basis of all or any of the property-receipts-payroll fractions does not properly reflect the activity, business, receipts, capital, entire net worth or entire net income of the taxpayer in New Jersey, the Director may adjust or the taxpayer may request an adjustment of the business allocation factor.

(b) Reduction in tax for income duplicated on a return filed with another State pursuant to N.J.S.A. 54:10A-8 and this rule—100 percent allocation factor:

1. Eligibility:

i. Where the Business Allocation Factor under Section 6 of the Act is 100 percent and the taxpayer in fact paid a tax based on or measured by income to a foreign state, resulting in a duplication of income being taxed, it may, under Section 8 of the Act, apply for a reduction in the amount of its tax. The reduction is available only where the taxpayer in its own right acquired a taxable status in the foreign state by reference to at least one of the criteria described at N.J.A.C. 18:7-1.6 as if the New Jersey Corporation Business Tax Act were the law of that foreign state.

Example: S corporation does not maintain a regular place of business outside New Jersey, other than a statutory office. It was not a domestic corporation in State X, nor did it meet any of the other criteria described at N.J.A.C. 18:7-1.6 in that State which would have created a taxable status in New Jersey. Although it was not itself doing business in State X,

it was a member of an affiliated group of corporations which conducted a unitary business in that State and as such is permitted or required to join in filing a combined or consolidated return in State X. In fact, it did so.

Any duplication of income being reported to New Jersey and to State X may not form the basis for a reduction in the tax.

2. Method:

i. An eligible taxpayer computes its reduction on a rider attached to its return by demonstrating that a part of entire net income is duplicated on a return filed with another state. It must attach a copy of all relevant portions of the return filed with the foreign state relating to income reported, the computation of all components of its apportionment fractions and the computation of the tax paid to the foreign state. It must also submit a schedule apportioning all property, receipts and payroll to a common denominator defined consistent with the return. For purposes of calculating the reduction:

(1) It may be based upon only so much of adjusted entire net income appearing on its Corporation Business Tax Return as is reported to the foreign state;

(2) The formula apportionment used in the foreign state may not exceed the Business Allocation Factor as determined under Section 6 of the Act and these rules;

(3) It must be computed by using the lesser of the tax rates of the foreign state or the tax rate under the New Jersey Corporation Business Tax Act.

Example 1: Corporation A does not maintain a regular place of business outside New Jersey other than a statutory office. As a consequence, its Business Allocation Factor is 100 percent. It sold land for \$250,000 which had a tax basis and book value of \$100,000 and was situated in State Y. Under the laws of State Y, the entire gain is directly allocable to that State and is taxed at an eight percent rate. It may determine the portion of its tax which is measured by net income as follows:

| | New Jersey Tax Income Base | Duplicated in State Y |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Gross income exclusive of gain on sale of land | \$500,000 | |
| Net gain on sale of land | + 150,000 | \$150,000 |
| Total income | 650,000 | |
| Deductions | -447,778 | |
| Taxable income before net operating deductions and special deductions | 202,222 | |
| Adjustments—N.J. Corporation Business Tax Deducted—add back | + 20,000 | |
| Entire net income | <u>\$222,222</u> | |
| Tax at 9%—before reduction | \$20,000 | |
| Formula apportionment not used in State Y | | 100% |

| | New Jersey Tax Income Base | Duplicated in State Y |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Duplication of income | | 150,000 |
| Reduction—may not exceed 9% | | <u>.08</u> |
| Tax paid to State Y | | <u>\$ 12,000</u> |
| Reduction | <u>-12,000</u> | |
| Paid with return | <u>\$8,000</u> | |

Example 2: Corporation B does not maintain a regular place of business outside New Jersey other than a statutory office. Its Business Allocation Factor is 100 percent. It did however start and complete a construction job in State Z and paid an income tax to that State at a ten and one-half percent rate. It may determine the portion of its Corporation Business Tax measured by net income as follows:

For accounting periods beginning before July 1, 1996:

| | New Jersey Tax Income Base | Duplicated in State Z |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions | \$227,500 | \$227,500 |
| Add ACRS | \$ 15,000 | |
| Less NJ depreciation | <u>12,000</u> | 3,000 |
| Add ACRS | 15,000 | |
| Less State Z Depreciation | <u>15,000</u> | -0- |
| †Add back of NJCBT, other States, Political Subdivisions, etc. tax paid or accrued | 52,000 | 52,000 |
| Taxes imposed or measured by income from State Z return | 28,800 | 28,800 |
| Municipal bond interest add back—NJ | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Municipal Bond Interest add back—State Z | -0- | -0- |
| Net Operating Loss—NJ | 4,500 | (4,500) |
| Net Operating Loss—State Z | 5,000 | (5,000) |
| Dividend Exclusion—NJ | 10,000 | (10,000) |
| Dividend Exclusion—State Z | -0- | |
| Entire Net Income | <u>\$275,000</u> | |
| Portion of ENI duplicated | | \$241,300 |
| Apportionment (computed below) | | <u>250,000</u> |
| Apportioned duplicated ENI | | \$ 60,325 |
| Tax at 9% on New Jersey Income Base | \$ 24,750 | |
| Tax at State Z rate (10 1/2%) on Apportioned duplicated ENI | | <u>\$ 6,33</u> |
| Reduction—at 9% of Apportioned duplicated ENI (\$60,325) | <u>\$ 5,429</u> | |
| New Jersey tax after credit | <u>\$ 19,321</u> | |

† For accounting periods beginning on or before July 7, 1993 only, New Jersey CBT was required to be added back in computing New Jersey E.N.I.

For accounting periods beginning on or after July 1, 1996:

| | New Jersey Tax Income Base | Duplicated in State Z |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Taxable income before net operating loss deduction and special deductions | \$227,500 | \$227,500 |
| Add ACRS | \$15,000 | |
| Less NJ depreciation | <u>15,000</u> | 3,000 |
| Add ACRS | 15,000 | |
| Less State Z Depreciation | <u>15,000</u> | -0- |
| Add back of NJCBT, other States, Political Subdivisions, etc. tax paid or accrued | 52,000 | 52,000 |
| Taxes imposed or measured by income from State Z return | 28,800 | 28,800 |
| Municipal bond interest add back—NJ | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Municipal Bond Interest add back—State Z | -0- | -0- |
| Net Operating Loss—NJ | 4,500 | (4,500) |
| Net Operating Loss—State Z | 5,000 | (5,000) |
| Dividend Exclusion—NJ | 10,000 | (10,000) |
| Dividend Exclusion—State Z | -0- | |
| Entire Net Income | <u>\$275,000</u> | |
| Portion of ENI duplicated | | \$241,300 |
| Apportionment (computed below) | | <u>245,000</u> |
| Apportioned duplicated ENI | | \$59,118 |
| Tax at 9% on New Jersey Income Base | \$24,750 | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <u>New Jersey Tax</u> <u>Income Base</u> | <u>Duplicated in</u> <u>State Z</u> |
| Tax at State Z rate (10 1/2%) on Apportioned duplicated ENI | | <u>\$6.20</u> |
| Reduction—at 9% of Apportioned duplicated ENI (\$59,118) | \$5,321 | _____ |
| New Jersey tax after credit | \$19,429 | |

Corporation B computed the apportionment on its State Z return as follows:

| | <u>State Z</u> | <u>Every-</u> <u>where</u> | <u>Portion in State</u> <u>Z</u> |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Property Fraction | | | |
| Owned (Valued under State Z law and regulation) | \$140,000 | \$ 500,000 | |
| Leased (at 8 times annual rentals) | <u>\$ 40,000</u> | <u>\$ 100,000</u> | |
| Total Property Fraction | \$180,000 | \$ 600,000 | 0.300000 |
| Receipts Fraction | \$200,000 | \$1,000,000 | 0.200000 |
| Double Weighting of Receipts Fraction | | | 0.200000 |
| Payroll Fraction | \$ 90,000 | \$ 300,000 | 0.300000 |
| Total of Fractions | | | 1.000000 |
| Allocation Factor using State Z Law and Regulation (Total divided by four) | | | 0.250000 |

For accounting periods beginning before July 1, 1996, if the formula apportionment had been determined in State Z consistent with the N.J. Corporation Business Tax Act, it would have been:

| | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Property Fraction | | | |
| Owned (Valued under N.J.C.B.T. Act) | \$100,000 | \$ 400,000 | |
| Leased (at 8 times rentals) | <u>\$ 40,000</u> | <u>\$ 100,000</u> | |
| Total Property Fraction | \$140,000 | \$ 500,000 | 0.280000 |
| Receipts Fraction | \$200,000 | \$1,000,000 | 0.200000 |
| Payroll Fraction | \$ 90,000 | \$ 300,000 | 0.300000 |
| Total of Fractions | | | 0.780000 |
| Allocation Factor using N.J.C.B.T. Act (Total divided by three) | | | 0.260000 |

For accounting periods beginning on or after July 1, 1996, if the formula apportionment has been determined in State Z consistent with the N.J. Corporation Business Tax Act, it would have been:

| | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Property Fraction | | | |
| Owned (Valued under N.J.C.B.T. Act) | \$100,000 | \$ 400,000 | |
| Leased (at 8 times rentals) | <u>\$ 40,000</u> | <u>\$ 100,000</u> | |
| Total Property Fraction | \$140,000 | \$ 500,000 | 0.280000 |
| Receipts Fraction | \$200,000 | \$1,000,000 | 0.200000 |
| Double Weighting of Receipts Fraction | | | 0.200000 |
| Payroll Fraction | \$ 90,000 | \$ 300,000 | 0.300000 |
| Total of Fractions | | | 0.980000 |
| Allocation Factor using N.J.C.B.T. Act (Total divided by four) | | | 0.245000 |

For the period beginning prior to July 1, 1996, since the apportionment fraction (.250000) used in State Z does not exceed the Business Allocation Factor as it would have been determined under the Act and this subchapter, it is used for purposes of determining the reduction.

For the period beginning on or after July 1, 1996, since the apportionment fraction (.250000) used in state Z exceeds the Business Allocation Factor as it would have been determined under the Act and this subchapter, the New Jersey Factor (.245000) would be used for purposes of determining the reduction.

Amended by R.1984 d.594, effective January 7, 1985.
See: 16 N.J.R. 3001(a), 17 N.J.R. 115(c).
(b) added.
Amended by R.1997 d.429, effective October 6, 1997.

See: 29 N.J.R. 3426(a), 29 N.J.R. 4324(a).
Rewrote tables in (b)2i(3).

Statutory References

See N.J.S.A. 54:10A-8 as to right of Director to independently adjust a taxpayer's allocation factor.

Law Review and Journal Commentaries

Tax Law. Robert J. Alter, Jay Soled, 135 N.J.L.J. S53 (1993).

Case Notes

Corporate taxpayer was entitled to credit for income tax paid in another state. *Kettler Realty Corp. v. Director, Div. of Taxation*, 12 N.J.Tax 470 (1992), affirmed 14 N.J.Tax 165.

Redetermination of net worth tax which was not unreasonable or unfair would not be disturbed. *Kettler Realty Corp. v. Director, Div. of Taxation*, 12 N.J.Tax 470 (1992), affirmed 14 N.J.Tax 165.