

Vol.24, 013 February 21, 2023

# New Hampshire law prohibits nonresident state income tax on residents working remotely for out-of-state employers

#### Summary

- New Hampshire legislation seeks to protect residents who work for out-of-state employers by prohibiting nonresident states from imposing an income tax on services performed within the state.
- It is unlikely the legislation will deter states like New York from enforcing the convenience of the employer rule.
- The U.S. Supreme Court has twice declined to hear cases concerning the constitutionality of the convenience of the employer rule.

New Hampshire Governor Chris Sununu signed into law <u>H.B. 1097</u>, which declares that income earned or received by New Hampshire residents for services performed entirely within the state shall not be subject to the personal income tax of any other state.

The law is primarily intended to protect New Hampshire teleworkers from nonresident states that require income tax and withholding regardless of the physical work location if the employee works for an employer within the nonresident state (i.e., convenience of the employer rule).

A controversy arose during the COVID-19 emergency when Massachusetts adopted temporary rules that required Massachusetts employers to continue to withhold Massachusetts income tax for employees working remotely in New Hampshire. (See EY Tax Alert 2020-1081.) The effect of the Massachusetts temporary rule was the imposition of Massachusetts income tax on New Hampshire remote workers who were otherwise not subject to a state personal income tax.

Prior to the September 13, 2021 expiration of the Massachusetts temporary rules, New Hampshire filed a

case with the U.S. Supreme Court contesting the Massachusetts income tax imposed on its remote workers. On June 28, 2021, the U.S. Supreme Court <u>declined</u> to hear the case. (<u>See EY Tax Alert 2021-1316</u>.)

Although the Massachusetts income tax on the wages of New Hampshire's remote workers is no longer required, several states (and localities) have permanently adopted the convenience of the employer rule (e.g., New York).

### Ernst & Young LLP insights

It is doubtful that New Hampshire law will deter states like New York from enforcing the convenience of the employer rule; however, it does present a different set of facts should challenges reach the U.S. Supreme Court. The U.S. Supreme Court has twice declined to hear challenges on the constitutionality of the rule.

### Contact us for more information

## Workforce Tax Services - Employment Tax Advisory Services

Kristie Lowery kristie.lowery@ey.com

Ken Hausser Kenneth.hausser@ey.com

Debera Salam debera.salam@ey.com

The information contained herein is general in nature and is not intended, and should not be construed, as legal, accounting or tax advice or opinion provided by Ernst & Young LLP to the reader. The reader is also cautioned that this material may not be applicable to, or suitable for, the reader's specific circumstances or needs, and may require consideration of non-tax and other tax factors if any action is to be contemplated. The reader should contact his or her Ernst and Young LLP or other tax professional prior to taking any action based upon this information. Ernst & Young LLP assumes no obligation to inform the reader of any changes in tax laws or other factors that could affect the information contained herein. Copyright 2023. Ernst & Young LLP. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, retransmitted or otherwise redistributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including by photocopying, facsimile transmission, recording, rekeying, or using any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from Ernst & Young LLP.