1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
2	OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS	
3	400 R STREET	
4	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT	
10	JUNE 26, 2018	
11	CORPORATE FRANCHISE AND PERSONAL INCOME TAX HEARING	
12	APPEAL OF	
13	ANTHONY OTTLINGER	
14	18011758	
15	AGAINST PROPOSED ASSESSMENT OF	
16	ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	Reported by: Kathleen Skidgel	
28	CSR No. 9039	

1		
1		<u>S</u> <u>E</u> <u>N</u> <u>T</u>
2	Panel Lead:	Grant Thompson Administrative Law Judge
3	Panel Members:	Sara Hosey Administrative Law Judge
5		Michael Geary
6	Office of Tax	Administrative Law Judge
7	Appeals Staff:	Dana Holmes Ombudsperson
8	Appearing for Taxpayer:	Anthony Ottlinger Taxpayer
9		laxpayer
10	Appearing for Franchise Tax Board:	Samantha Nguyen
11	rianchise lax boald.	Tax Counsel
12		000
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 400 R STREET, HEARING ROOM 2 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 3 JUNE 26, 2018 ---000---4 5 JUDGE THOMPSON: We are on the record in 6 the appeal of Anthony Ottlinger, case number 7 18011758. We're here in Sacramento. The date is 8 Tuesday, June 26, 2018, and the time is 9 10 approximately 9:13. As I mentioned before we went on record, my 11 12 name's Grant Thompson. I'm the lead Administrative 13 Law Judge for this hearing. And my fellow 14 co-panelists today are Michael Geary, to my left, 15 and Sara Hosey, to my right. 16 Franchise Tax Board, could you please 17 identify yourself once more for the record. 18 MS. NGUYEN: Samantha Nguyen, counsel for 19 respondent Franchise Tax Board. 20 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. And Mr. 21 Ottlinger. MR. OTTLINGER: Anthony Ottlinger. 22 2.3 JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. Representing yourself today, thank you. 2.4 25 As I mentioned before we went on record, 26 the issue today is whether appellant's entitled to a 2.7 refund of additional tax, a late filing penalty and interest paid for 2014. 28

And we've reviewed all the documents that have been provided by the parties, the Franchise Tax Board's brief and, Mr. Ottlinger, your appeal letter and your attachments. Franchise Tax Board provided an additional document today, a Federal Wage Transcript for 2014. And we're going to consider all those items admitted into the record for our consideration.

My understanding is that neither party has any additional evidence today other than the wage and income transcript which the Franchise Tax Board provided and that neither party is providing any witnesses other than, Mr. Ottlinger, you may represent yourself and tell your story at the hearing; is that correct?

MS. NGUYEN: Correct.

1.3

2.3

2.4

2.7

JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. Let's go ahead and get started. So, Mr. Ottlinger, I want you to stand and raise your right hand so I can place you under oath.

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. OTTLINGER: I do.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you.

All right. So when you're ready, Mr.
Ottlinger, I would like you to just do what you
started to do earlier, explain why you're here
today, what happened, and why you believe you're

entitled to a refund.

1.3

2.3

2.4

2.7

You'll have 20 minutes. I would suggest you should focus on what amount of tax do you believe is due, if any, and why. Because that's what we're here to decide rather than procedural and process issues. We're focused on, are you entitled to a refund. And if you're entitled to a refund, we want to figure that out and get that to you.

Are you ready to begin?

MR. OTTLINGER: Yes, sir.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. You'll have 20 minutes, and you may begin.

MR. OTTLINGER: The Franchise Tax Board wanted my W-2s for the year 2014, so I made a copy of it and I mailed it to them.

They stated that they never received the W-2 forms, and I wrote them back that I know we have postal problems in this area and I told them that I can't control what the post office -- how they handle the mail. I put a stamp on there, and how they handle it, it's on them, it's out of my hands.

So I had to mail it again to them. They said I was late on the W-2s. And one letter that I reviewed last night, said that the W-2s were invalid. And they said, well, those were the W-2s that were provided by my employer University of California UC Davis.

And they said they were going to -- they

laid out a plan of what my penalties were going to be, but it wasn't, uh -- they didn't break it down why the penalties, how much it's going to be, individually. And when they told me how the amount was, I wrote down too much for 2014. Not for the prior years, but for that year.

2.3

2.4

2.7

So I made out a check for them to be safe about it. And I don't know what the penalty would have been or what would have happened. And I feel I'm being cheated out of my money. And I know with the state budget and everything, they're trying to get as much money off the taxpayers as they can, and the fiscal year starts next month.

And the reason why I'm here is that, yes, I feel that I'm entitled to a refund. And the Tax Board, they should make their accuracies if they're going to penalize taxpayers with their interest in a more accuracy way, and that's what I basically asked for and I never got it.

So I made out the money order out for them.

Actually it was a cashier's check, and like it was done. And I couldn't -- I couldn't accept it.

That's why I wrote a letter to the Appeals Board.

And I've got letters from them, they even told me last week to call them up all last weekend.

I don't have a phone. You know, I'm retired for four years now. I work for a private owner part-time. And I gave up my phone. I don't

even have an e-mail. I know you guys ask me for my e-mail address and I don't have one. I'm retired, and I get a pension once a month, and every two weeks on my private contractor.

2.3

2.4

2.7

And I think they're asking too much for the year 2014. Doesn't state previous years that I owe them. And, you know, I don't know what's going on with the Franchise Tax Board, if their records, how accurate are they and who's responsible for the assessment form. Because the one I got was a proposed assessment form, and they said when they got my 2014, I'm thinking finally they got it and they said they're going to revise the assessment form that I never received, you know.

And basically I'm just saying, well -- and I've had people say, well, that's the Tax Board for you. And I said, yeah, I know and I'm learning it the hard way, you know.

I don't think I would be here if the Franchise Tax Board and I, if we would work together on this, and it doesn't look like it happened. And I'm a reasonable person, you know.

You know, I know I was late on the taxes.

You know, I'm not perfect. I don't like paying
taxes. I even told the IRS. They said, "Why don't
you pay taxes?"

"Because everybody cheats on their taxes, including the State of California."

1 They said, "Well, why didn't you have a tax 2 preparer do your taxes for you?" 3 "Because if I sign it and they make a mistake on it, I have to pay a penalty and so do 4 5 they." And she goes, "You know what, you're right. 6 7 So why did you bring it to us?" "Because you're the IRS, you can't make 8 9 mistakes." And then she goes, "Oh there'll be a fee 10 for that." 11 12 And I ask, "Well, can you waive it?" 13 And she goes, "You have an answer for 14 everything, don't you?" 15 I think she was being sarcastic, and so was 16 I. And when she told me what my refund was, I said, "You know what? Why don't you go ahead and keep 17 18 it." \$200 for all that talk that we did, and it's 19 just not worth my time. 20 And as I said before, if the Franchise Tax 21 Board was willing to help work with me, you know, I 22 don't think this would be necessary. 2.3 And like I said before, I just ask for 2.4 accuracy on my penalties and interest. 25 JUDGE THOMPSON: Do you have anything to 26 add at this point? 2.7 MR. OTTLINGER: Yeah. The only thing I'm 28 not comfortable about the hearing is that all this

is being recorded, you know. And I'm sure that you guys are writing things down and I don't know if everything I'm saying is being recorded and is being written down. And I don't have the paper here to document everything. And the Tax Board and the Tax Appeals Board, you guys told me to call you up. Well, the reason why I don't make phone calls like this is because it doesn't reserve my rights under current law. You guys -- I can call you up and you guys can tell me you never received a call from me, just like the Tax Board. I can do the same thing, and they said they never received a call and I can't prove it.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Yeah. So the proceedings today are being transcribed. That's why we have our hearing reporter here taking notes, so to ensure we have an accurate record.

Okay. With that, Franchise Tax Board are you ready with your presentation?

MS. NGUYEN: Yes.

1.3

2.3

2.4

2.7

JUDGE THOMPSON: You may begin.

MS. NGUYEN: Appellant received sufficient income to require him to file a return, all of which are taxable.

Appellant's Federal Wage and Income

Transcript shows that appellant received income more
than the filing threshold amount. At no point does
appellant dispute receiving this income. The income

appellant received during the tax year includes wages, pension income and interest income, all of which are taxable as determined by the courts and the Board of Equalization. This income also serves as the basis of respondent's assessment.

1.3

2.3

2.4

2.7

Appellant did not file a valid return.

When FTB asked for a return, not his W-2s, he has submitted W-2s which does not constitute a return.

He also submitted four blank 540s. In the Appeal of LaVonne A. Hodgson the Board held that returns which do not contain sufficient data from which respondent can compute and assess the tax liability of a taxpayer are not valid returns. Accordingly, appellant did not show error in respondent's assessment.

Appellant did not demonstrate the delinquent filing penalty may be late. Appellant himself has conceded that he filed late, therefore the delinquent filing penalty was imposed. This is the only penalty that was imposed. This penalty is also shown on the bill dated March 27, 2017, which was mailed to appellant and was in response to this bill, which clearly indicates the penalty amount and the name of the penalty. It was in response to this bill that appellant made his payment, paying the tax due in full.

The penalty may be abated for a reasonable cause, and in addition to not filing a valid return

appellant's arguments that he does not know how to complete a return and that no one would help him or that tax preparers can make mistakes too do not meet the reasonable cause standard.

Interest may also not be abated in this matter. Appellant paid the balance due and full after the April 15th deadline and his arguments do not support abatement under the law. For the reasons cited respondent respectfully requests its denial of appellant's claim for refund be sustained.

Thank you.

2.3

2.4

2.7

JUDGE THOMPSON: Mr. Ottlinger, would you like to briefly reply? Is there anything you'd like to add? You're not required to, but you have the opportunity.

MR. OTTLINGER: Anything to add?

JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, anything in reply to what the representative of the Franchise Tax Board had to say?

MR. OTTLINGER: I noticed her dates and stuff. I heard her dates and everything, but that doesn't -- that really doesn't mean anything to me. It's just their convenient way of adding cases like this. They're professionally trained for it.

But I think the point we're getting here is I did what I was supposed to do and I said what I had to say, and it's just my word against hers. And that's what it is. That's what it's all about here.

1 It's me against them, and I just want to see justice 2 done. 3 JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay, thank you. 4 I'm going to ask my co-panelists, 5 Mr. Geary, do you have any questions? JUDGE GEARY: For Ms. Nguyen, the document 6 7 that you submitted today --8 MS. NGUYEN: The Wage and Income 9 Transcript? 10 JUDGE GEARY: Can you just briefly describe 11 the components that went into the underlying 12 liability and describe the evidence that Franchise 13 Tax Board relied upon to determine each component? MS. NGUYEN: Sure. So the basis of our 14 15 proposed assessment was the W-2 that's issued by the 16 Regents of University of California Davis for wages 17 of 26,614. 18 Our proposed assessment also includes a 19 Form 1099 interest that was reported by SAFE Credit 20 Union in the amount of \$32. 21 Our assessment also includes the 1099-R 22 which was issued by Fidelity Investments in the 2.3 amount of 18,445. 2.4 They also include the second 1099-R issued 25 by Fidelity in the amount of 12,219. 26 Now, at the time our assessment was issued, we didn't have information for the two additional 2.7 28 1099-R's that were reported for Mr. Ottlinger by

1 UC Regents in the amount of 7,384 and 4,498. 2 JUDGE GEARY: And were those last two 3 amounts also included in the liability? MS. NGUYEN: No. 4 5 JUDGE GEARY: They were not? 6 MS. NGUYEN: They were not. Yeah. 7 didn't capture that at the time of our proposed 8 assessment calculation. JUDGE GEARY: Okay. And did you receive 9 10 copies of the 1099s directly from the entities 11 Fidelity and UC Regents; is that where you received 12 them? 1.3 MS. NGUYEN: No. We received the income 14 information reported -- for the wages, we get it 15 from EDD. 16 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. 17 MS. NGUYEN: And then the 1099s, I believe -- we receive it from the IRS. 18 19 JUDGE GEARY: EDD is Employment Development 20 Department? 21 MS. NGUYEN: Correct. 22 JUDGE GEARY: Thank you. 2.3 That's all I have. Thank you. 2.4 JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. 25 Geary. 26 Ms. Hosey, do you have any questions? 2.7 JUDGE HOSEY: No. Thank you. 28 JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. I want to thank

both parties for coming in today.

1.3

2.3

2.4

2.7

MS. NGUYEN: Judge, may I speak?

JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, please.

MS. NGUYEN: I just wanted to note that upon further review of the matter, it appears that there is an error in our footnote number one of respondent's opening brief. Our footnote was correcting the amount at issue and it actually is incorrect, so please disregard --

JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. We noticed that and corrected it.

MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.

JUDGE THOMPSON: All right. Thank you both for coming in today. And I want to reiterate that we have reviewed all the materials submitted by the parties, and we're accepting all the materials into the record, including the Wage and Income Transcript that FTB provided today.

At this point I'm going to close the record and I'm going to close the hearing. After we leave today, myself and my co-panelists will meet and discuss the evidence and the arguments we've heard. And then within 100 days we'll mail the written opinion to the parties for the parties to see the outcome of the case and our reasoning behind it.

MR. OTTLINGER: So when you say an "opinion," what are you talking about?

JUDGE THOMPSON: It's a written decision

1	that sets out the reasons for the panel's decision
2	and discusses the evidence and the arguments that
3	we've seen. So it would probably be relatively
4	short, three to five pages, and hopefully explain
5	the basis for how the panel determined. Okay?
6	MR. OTTLINGER: And you said earlier,
7	before the hearing, that you guys are no related to
8	the Franchise Tax Board.
9	JUDGE THOMPSON: Correct.
10	MR. OTTLINGER: But you both work for the
11	State of California.
12	JUDGE THOMPSON: That's correct, sir.
13	MR. OTTLINGER: That's what I thought.
14	JUDGE THOMPSON: But I do not report to the
4 -	
15	Franchise Tax Board. I'm a totally separate
15 16	Franchise Tax Board. I'm a totally separate agency.
16	agency.
16 17	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done?
16 17 18	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done? JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, we are.
16 17 18 19	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done? JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, we are. MR. OTTLINGER: Thank you.
16 17 18 19 20	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done? JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, we are. MR. OTTLINGER: Thank you. JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. The hearing's
16 17 18 19 20 21	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done? JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, we are. MR. OTTLINGER: Thank you. JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. The hearing's now closed.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done? JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, we are. MR. OTTLINGER: Thank you. JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. The hearing's now closed. (The proceedings concluded at 9:28 a.m.)
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done? JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, we are. MR. OTTLINGER: Thank you. JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. The hearing's now closed. (The proceedings concluded at 9:28 a.m.)
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done? JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, we are. MR. OTTLINGER: Thank you. JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. The hearing's now closed. (The proceedings concluded at 9:28 a.m.)
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	agency. MR. OTTLINGER: Are we done? JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, we are. MR. OTTLINGER: Thank you. JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. The hearing's now closed. (The proceedings concluded at 9:28 a.m.)

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	State of California)
4) ss
5	County of Sacramento)
6	
7	I, Kathleen Skidgel, Hearing Reporter for
8	the California State Office of Tax Appeals certify
9	that on June 26, 2018 I recorded verbatim, in
10	shorthand, to the best of my ability, the
11	proceedings in the above-entitled hearing; that I
12	transcribed the shorthand writing into typewriting;
13	and that the preceding pages 1 through 15 constitute
14	a complete and accurate transcription of the
15	shorthand writing.
16	
17	Dated: July 5, 2018
18	
19	
20	Helle Steedard
21	Randon Sourge
22	
23	KATHLEEN SKIDGEL, CSR #9039
24	Hearing Reporter
25	
26	
27	
2.8	