# BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,	)
	)
ROBERT G. KETCHUM,	) OTA NO. 18011175
	)
APPELLANT.	)
	)
	)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Los Angeles, California

Wednesday, April 24, 2019

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5 6 7 8 9	IN THE MATTER OF THE OF,  ROBERT G. KETCHUM,  APPELLANT.  )  ()  ()  ()  ()  ()  ()  ()  ()  ()
11	
12	
13 14	Transcript of Proceedings, taken at
15	355 South Grand Avenue, South Tower, 23rd Floor,
16	Los Angeles, California, 91401,
17	commencing at 10:02 a.m. and concluding
18	at 10:22 a.m., on Wednesday, April 24, 2019,
19	reported by Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter,
20	in and for the State of California.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Panel Lead:	Hon. TERESA STANLEY
4	Panel Members:	Hon. KENNY GAST
5	ranei members.	Hon. LINDA CHENG
6	For the Appellant:	JOHN C. LEVINE
7	ror the Apperrant.	COIN C. HEVINE
8	For the Respondent:	State of California Franchise Tax Board
9		By: BRIAN MILLER MARIA BROSTERHOUS
10		TAX COUNSEL
11		Legal Division P.O. Box 1720
12		Rancho Cordova, CA 95741 916-845-2498
13		710 010 2170
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2	ODENTING GERMENE	
3	OPENING STATEMENT	
5	PAGE	
6 7 8	By Mr. Levine 7 By Mr. Miller 13	
9		
10 11	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
12 13 14	(Franchise Tax Board's Exhibits were received at 6.)	
15 16 17	CLOSING STATEMENT  PAGE	
18 19 20	By Mr. Levine 15	
21		
22 23		
24		
25		

1 Los Angeles, California; Wednesday, April 24, 2019 2 10:02 a.m. 3 4 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: We are going on the record. 5 6 This is the matter of appeal of 7 Robert G. Ketchum, Case No. 18011175. The date is April 24th, 2019. The time is 10:02 a.m., and we're in 8 9 Los Angeles, California. Once again, I am 10 Judge Teresa Stanley, and I have Judge Kenneth Gast and 11 Judge Linda Cheng with me. 12 And once again, I'm going to ask the parties to 13 identify themselves for the record. MR. LEVINE: John LeVine, EA. I'm representing 14 15 Robert Ketchum. And the reason is because of the fact 16 that basically it's my error that I am here for. 17 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you. 18 MR. MILLER: I am Brian Miller representing 19 Respondent Franchise Tax Board. 2.0 MS. BROSTERHOUS: I'm Maria Brosterhous. And 21 I'll spell that for you, B-r-o-s-t-e-r-h-o-u-s. 22 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you. 23 And particularly, Mr. LeVine, you haven't done this 24 before. If you have any questions at any point, feel free 25 to ask them.

1 MR. LEVINE: No problem. 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. We're first going to admit appellant's Exhibits 1 through 4 into 3 4 the record and Respondent's Exhibits A through E. will be admitted unless there's an objection. 5 none, I'm going to admit those. 6 7 (Appellant's Exhibits 1-4 were received in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 8 (Respondent's Exhibits A-E were received 9 10 in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 11 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: So we had determined at our prehearing conference that opening 12 13 statements would not be necessary. So Mr. LeVine, I'm going to ask you to stand and 14 15 raise your right hand, please. 16 17 JOHN C. LEVINE, 18 produced as a witness by and on behalf of the appellant, 19 and having been first duly sworn by the Administrative Law 20 Judge, was examined and testified as follows: 21 22 I do. MR. LEVINE: 23 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you. You may be seated. Okay. I'm going to let you go ahead 24

25

and proceed with your case.

#### OPENING STATEMENT

2.0

MR. LEVINE: The situations is that I prepared the tax return for Robert Ketchum. I mailed it to him for signatures. He returned it to me well within the time to e-file it for him, and that's the only way it can be done right now. And I filed it and went through my normal procedures of checking for it.

I thought I had seen it within the group of clients that I had, you know, e-mailed to the IRS and to the Franchise Tax Board. And I was going back through the list a second time about two or three days later, and I saw that Robert Ketchum's return was still in the file. It wasn't e-filed. And I basically e-filed it immediately so that it would go in.

And I e-filed a -- or I basically appealed the one with the IRS, and they also had a six-month penalty on it. And I basically had it where -- since it was one month late -- or actually several days late, the issue was that they would grant me a one-month penalty against my filing, and I would be forgiven of the balance.

And I cannot afford to pay these types of penalties. And you know, it's a case of I'm on my way out in the sense of if I have to pay penalties like this, I can't do it. So that's basically it. And I'm just basically asking for a reduction in the penalty to a

1 one-month penalty and just have it taken there. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. 2 Is that 3 what you want to say today? 4 MR. LEVINE: Yes, that's what I want to say 5 today. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Does the 6 7 Franchise Tax Board have any questions, Mr. Miller? MR. MILLER: No questions, Your Honor. 8 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Judge Gast? 9 10 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GAST: No questions. 11 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Judge Cheng? 12 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE CHENG: No questions. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: I actually do. 13 Is there more to the story or the file? 14 MR. LEVINE: Well, basically there's more in the 15 16 file than just what I'm saying here. But basically, the 17 issue that is out of that thing or what it all gets boiled 18 down to is the fact that, besides having the medical 19 issues and stuff that are in the file, it was basically 20 the fact that I had come back, you know, within the context of the week or so filing the due date of the 21 22 return. 23 I saw it sitting there and basically panicked, 24 and then I immediately filed it. And as I say, you know, 25 I can't -- \$9,000 or whatever the number is right now, I

can't, you know, continue doing it and making a living at it. Because if I'm charging 4 or \$500 or \$1000 for a return, there's no way I can pay a \$9,000 fee.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Based on what we saw in the file with the medical record, can you let us know kind of how the dates worked with the date you were released back by your doctor to go back to work, and also whether anybody was taking care of your practice while you were unable to do so?

MR. LEVINE: My office manager, who is my wife, was doing it. I was basically hospitalized for seven weeks over here at the USC Hospital and -- let me take some water.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Sure. Take your time.

MR. LEVINE: And I basically came out of there. I had a stroke, and I -- the stroke was serious enough that I, for the first four-and-a-half weeks or so, I was out of it. I apparently was doing -- talking and stuff with people, but I was out of it.

And the conditions were so bad that the doctors mentioned to my wife that there was a possibility that I was going to need nursing care -- 24-hour nursing care.

And as there's a -- I believe there's a letter from my GP in there, and some other stuff that I sent.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: And do you remember the date that you went back to work?

2.0

MR. LEVINE: I can tell you the date I left work. I left work around 6:00 o'clock or 7:00 o'clock in the morning, and I apparently drove home. I don't have any remembrance of it. And my wife found me on the bottom of the bed or the floor of the bed where I was apparently putting on or taking off clothes. And so she called to take me to the hospital, and the -- and I basically was checked in for the next four-and-a-half weeks.

I was totally out of it. And I would say it was around -- I want to say it was the 14th of April, and it was in the morning.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. But then at some point your doctor did release you to work at least part-time. That's the reason the file --

MR. LEVINE: Right. Right.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Do you remember around when?

MR. LEVINE: Well, basically, it was -- I was out of it for the year coming, and it was -- I basically came home. I was not allowed to do much. I probably went through, I think August, before I could really go back to work full time. And as I say, it was a case that it was one return, and it happened to be a big return.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: In your practice, do you normally relay back to your clients when tax returns have been processed and accepted? Do you provide them that information?

MR. LEVINE: I mean, not regularly, no. It's once they send back the documents, I knowledge the receipt of the documents to them. And I then tell them that, you know, I will e-file it. And on that statement alone, they basically, you know, allow me to go forward with it. And this one here -- this client in particular is a client that we do bookkeeping and other services for on an ongoing situation. So he -- my wife, who is my office manager, is in regular contact with him.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. While you were out, was your wife processing other clients' returns?

MR. LEVINE: No. She doesn't have the authority to do it. In other words, I'm an EA and I can go ahead and do it. And basically she was leaving everything there, you know, for me to go forward with it. Plus I had all the extensions that, you know, she had to do on the last day.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: So she could file extensions, but she could not file returns?

MR. LEVINE: Well, she -- I mean, she can do it

1	in the sense that it's basically putting the information
2	in, and there's no signature on the form. And then she,
3	you know, took care of it that way.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: And when you
5	e-file for clients, do you have a system for checking
6	MR. LEVINE: Yes.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: to make
8	sure it's being done?
9	MR. LEVINE: Yes.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: And that
11	didn't happen in this case either?
12	MR. LEVINE: No.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: After the
14	follow-up does Mr. Miller, do you have any follow-up
15	questions?
16	MR. MILLER: No, I do not.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Judge Gast?
18	Judge Cheng?
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GAST: No.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE CHENG: No questions.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. So at
22	this point do you have anything else that you want the
23	panel to consider for Mr. Ketchum?
24	MR. LEVINE: Well, I would like you to consider
25	taking the penalty away. But short of that, I would like

to have it reduced to just one month.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. I don't know, since you just spoke and told your whole story, if you want to have any kind of closing statement?

MR. LEVINE: No.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: So I'm going to let the Franchise Tax Board speak to this, and then you can have the last word, if you want, to respond to anything they say.

MR. LEVINE: Okay.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Please proceed, Mr. Miller.

#### OPENING STATEMENT

MR. MILLER: So Respondent Franchise Tax Board properly imposed the filing penalty. That does not appear to be in dispute. Abating the penalty, however, under the law we cannot abate it unless appellant demonstrate a reasonable cause that prevented the timely filing of the return.

In this case, Mr. LeVine made a mistake, and it was filed late. However, the appellant cannot delegate his personal duty to a tax preparer or an attorney or anyone else to timely file a return. So the penalty is imposed on the appellant, not anyone else. So appellant,

not his tax preparer, was responsible for meeting the filing deadline.

In this case, we're sympathetic with Mr. LeVine's situation. However, the illness does not appear to have prevented the timely filing of the return. Because as he told us this morning, the return was already prepared. It was just a matter of the mechanics of e-filing that appear to have failed. Therefore, his illness, while not good for anyone's situation, it did not prevent him from filing the return timely for his client.

Regarding reducing the penalty to one month, even though he missed it by -- missed the extended deadline by three weeks, we are unable -- because the penalty goes back to the original filing deadline, which was April 18th, 2016, under the statute it -- you have to disregard -- or we disregard any extensions, which include the automatic six-month extension.

We're not sure about the IRS settlement or reduction. We don't have any information on that. The file we did request from IRS. We don't have the information yet. However, if it was the First Time Abatement Program, the Franchise Tax Board -- the State of California does not have that program.

And number two, if IRS reduced it based on reasonable cause, the Franchise Tax Board would be willing

to look at it and may reduce it. However, absence of showing a reasonable cause, the law does not have any way for us to do that.

So in conclusion, reasonable cause to abate the penalty has not been shown. And his illness did not prevent the timely filing for return.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: You've concluded?

MR. MILLER: I have concluded.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Mr. LeVine?

### CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. LEVINE: Basically it's the same. The argument is still the same in the sense that once Robert put the signed form back in the mail to me and I received it, I would have -- especially since it was a large return, I would have gone to the thing of making sure that it was filed and processed. I went through those steps.

I had a number of returns that I had to e-file that day. Excuse me. And apparently, I stand corrected relative to the -- how soon I saw it. But as I said in the beginning, you have to find a way to make it so that if I'm a week or two or three weeks late in e-filing, I have to be able to have it where it's only one month to submit it again.

And hopefully -- it's the only time I've ever had it where, you know, I was stuck with it and had a thing this big. And I was not in the position to pay it. And I'm not in the position now to pay it. And, you know, it's a case of I need help. And as I say, I, you know, will gladly accept, you know, one month abatement.

I mean taking it and reducing it to one month, but to have it all six months and everything else for what basically is a one-month mistake, you know, I can't -- I can't have it. Yeah.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. Is there anything else you want the panel to know before we adjourn?

MR. LEVINE: Not really.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. I've got a little housekeeping issue. I didn't state the issue for the record.

The issue is whether the late filing penalty should be abated, and whether appellant has shown reasonable cause to do so. And the second issue of whether there was reasonable cause to abate the electronic payment penalty has been withdrawn by the appellant. Can you confirm that, Mr. LeVine?

MR. LEVINE: Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: And

Mr. Miller, you don't object to it at all? 1 2 MR. MILLER: No objection, Judge. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. First I 3 4 want to let you know that I'm glad to see that you have recovered. 5 6 MR. LEVINE: Yes. 7 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: Because it doesn't sound like you were necessarily on the path to do 8 9 that at first, so I'm happy for you. 10 And this concludes our hearing. The judges will 11 meet and decide the case based on the documents and 12 testimony. 13 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GAST: I think FTB has something they want to say. 14 15 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: You wanted to 16 say something? 17 MS. BROSTERHOUS: I just wanted to let Mr. LeVine 18 know that once the amount goes final, if it does, that the 19 FTB does have programs to help him with payment and 20 programs that may reduce the payment. We have an installment payment agreement program, and we also have an 21 22 offer and comprise program. 23 MR. LEVINE: Okay. 24 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STANLEY: I'm glad you said that because it's not our role to do that, so thank 25

you. Okay. So we're going to adjourn this. We'll deliberate on this case amongst the three of us, and we'll mail a decision to you no later than a 100 days from today. So the record in this case is closed, and we will recess until the afternoon session. (Proceedings adjourned at 10:22 a.m.) 

## 1 HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter in and for 3 the State of California, do hereby certify: 4 That the foregoing transcript of proceedings was 5 6 taken before me at the time and place set forth, that the 7 testimony and proceedings were reported stenographically by me and later transcribed by computer-aided 8 9 transcription under my direction and supervision, that the foregoing is a true record of the testimony and 10 11 proceedings taken at that time. 12 I further certify that I am in no way interested in the outcome of said action. 13 14 I have hereunto subscribed my name this 16th day 15 of May, 2019. 16 17 18 19 ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER 20 2.1 22 23 24 25