1	HEARING
2	OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
4	000
5	In the Matter of the Franchise and
6	Business Tax Appeals Hearing of:
7	CITY TOWER CLUB 2200, LLC,
8	Appellant. NO. 18093832
9	×
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15	
16	THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2019
17	
18	10:44 A.M.
19	10:44 A.M. ORIGINAL
20	
21	OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
22	855 M STREET FRESNO, CALIFORNIA
23	
24	
25	Reported by GRACIE E. BECERRA, CSR No. 13136

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	Panel Lead:
4	JEFFREY ANGEJA, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
5	STATE OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS 400 R STREET
6	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95811
7	Panel Members:
8	MICHAEL GEARY, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
9	SARA HOSEY, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
10	
11	For Appellant:
12	PAUL GIENGER, TAXPAYER
13	
14	For Department of Tax and Fee Administration:
15	JARRETT NOBLE, TAX COUNSEL STEPHEN SMITH, TAX COUNSEL
16	LISA RENATI, HEARING REPRESENTATIVE  DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND FEE ADMINISTRATION
17	P.O. BOX 942879 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 94279
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS		
2		<b>D</b>	
3	APPELLANT'S EXHIBITS	<u>Page</u>	
4	Exhibits 1-3 admitted into evide	ence 5	
5	CDTFA'S EXHIBITS		
6	Exhibits A-D admitted into evide	ence 5	
7			
8	(Exhibits premarked and r	etained	
9	by Administrative Law Ju	dges.)	
LO			
L1			
L2			
L3			
L4			
L5			
L6			
L7			
L8			
L9			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2019 - 10:44 A.M.

ALJ ANGEJA: We're now on the record in the Office of Tax Appeals oral hearing for the Appeal of City Tower Club, case number 18093832. We're in Fresno, California. The date is July 18th, 2019, and the time is approximately quarter to 11:00. My name is Jeff Angeja. I'll be the lead administrative law judge for this hearing. My co-panelists today are Mike Geary and Sara Hosey.

ALJ HOSEY: Good morning.

ALJ ANGEJA: And, Appellant, could you please identify yourself for the record.

THE APPELLANT: Paul Gienger.

ALJ ANGEJA: Can you spell that?

THE APPELLANT: G-I-E-N-G-E-R.

16 ALJ ANGEJA: All right. Thank you. And for CDTFA?

MR. NOBLE: Jarrett Noble.

18 MR. SMITH: Steven Smith.

19 MS. RENATI: Lisa Renati.

ALJ ANGEJA: All right. Thank you. And this appeal involves one issue, which is whether appellant's membership fees constitute gross receipts subject to tax. During our preconferences the parties agreed to the -- agreed to the admission into evidence of Appellant's Exhibits 1 through 3. CDTFA had Exhibits A through D. And neither party had any

objection to the admission of those exhibits at that time.

Is that still correct? All right. Thank you. Then I
hereby admit those evidence -- sorry -- those exhibits into evidence.

(CDTFA's Exhibits A through D and Appellant's Exhibits 1 through 3 admitted into evidence.)

ALJ ANGEJA: And based on our prehearing conference, it's my understanding that neither party will have any witness testimony today.

I did swear in the prior taxpayer. I can do so for you. I didn't explain then, but I should. We don't -- we don't swear in the attorneys for the Department because they're making arguments. Their statements aren't evidence. If I swear you in, your statements would be evidence. We could rely on -- we could draw factual conclusions based on that. So if you would like me to swear you in, I can, otherwise you can just make your argument. We've got the facts in the record.

THE APPELLANT: I'll just make my arguments.

ALJ ANGEJA: Okay. All right. And as we agreed during our prehearing conference, we'll begin with appellant's argument not to exceed 30 minutes. CDTFA can then ask questions if they wish, as will the panel of judges. You've already seen how this works, so I can speed that up a bit. They've said their presentation would take about ten

minutes, you'll have a five-minute rebuttal, and after either party's presentations anybody, including the panel, can ask questions. If nobody has any procedural questions, we can get started. No? All right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Mr. Wil -- or sorry -- Mr. Gienger, go ahead and tell us your presentation.

THE APPELLANT: It's -- it appears to be pretty simple to me, although the language in the -- in the regulation is a little bit -- a little bit hard to understand. But just reading from the regulation in general, "Membership fees related to the anticipated retail sale of tangible personal property are includable in taxable gross receipts." And I quess my question is: What does "related to anticipated retail sale of tangible personal property, " what does that even mean? And in order to come up with an answer, I tried to find a business model where this would be applicable. And if you consider a business which charges \$100 for a membership fee in exchange for an agreement to settle to you at some point in time in the future for the sum of \$10 \$100 worth of goods, okay, clearly that membership fee is in exchange for some tangible personal property and should be That's not what we did. There was nothing tangible taxed. that our members received in exchange for the membership fee that they paid.

The Department's audit in the narrative provided

that -- that their audit concluded that the relationship between the cost of goods sold and the taxable sales met their criteria as reasonable; therefore, all of the tangible personal property consumed at the club by the members, sales tax was charged, collected, and paid to the Department.

The regulation continues on in part saying that "Charges for membership fees not related to anticipated retail transactions are not subject to tax." And it gives some examples of clubs talking about country clubs and golf and swimming and tennis and those types of things, but simply as examples, not to say that it's those organizations exclusively. So I just think that there should be a level playing field. And I look at -- at our club and I look at a country club which has social memberships where the social members don't pay sales tax on their membership dues, yet they don't play golf, they don't play tennis, they don't use the swimming pool. And they are our competitors. So we're at a -- put at a disadvantage if our membership fees are taxed and theirs are not.

I guess I'd like to talk a little bit about this whole process and give you a little bit of background about the Tower Club and how it got started. And I don't know how familiar you are with -- with the area in Ventura County where Oxnard is, but it's not close to much of anything and -- and, you know, a great distance from the San Fernando

Valley and far enough away from Santa Barbara. It's kind of out there on its own. And a man named Martin V. Smith, who traded in -- in the early 1940s traded a collection of jukeboxes for a piece of property in Oxnard and in exchange for a run-down hamburger stand. After World War II he went back to Oxnard and refurbished the hamburger stand and from that point going forward developed a multi-million dollar portfolio of real estate. He developed the Oxnard financial plaza where there are two tall buildings, the only two tall buildings between the San Fernando Valley and San Jose.

In 1987, he was constructing a 22-story building and having accumulated a substantial amount of wealth and a lot of life experiences, he wanted to create something very special. So he took the top floor of the 22-story building, got a bunch of his friends together and they started the Tower Club. The goal was never to make money. It was to create something special that the people who were

Mr. Smith's friends -- and he was one of those people who was kind of bigger than life, you loved to be around him, you loved to spend time with him, he threw great parties.

So the club attracted a lot of people that wanted to socialize with a group of people that were his friends. And he took in other members.

In 19 -- or ten years later, let's say pretty closely in the late 1990s, he decided that he was going to

sell his entire real estate portfolio, and the buyer of the financial plaza also got the Tower Club, not for any consideration, but Mr. Smith had no reason to run it and own it and didn't want the liability anymore, so it was kind of a throw-in in the transaction. That company's goal was to break up all of the real estate pieces as they were worth more in pieces more than they were as a whole, so they began selling off pieces.

In 2002, a man named John Anderson, through his investment company, purchased the financial plaza, and I worked for Mr. Anderson. So when he bought the plaza, again, the Tower Club was just a throw-in. It was a tenant in the building, it didn't really make any money, but it became one of his holdings, so it was put into a separate corporation. And ran the Tower Club the same as it had since 1987, and there were never any taxes paid on the membership fees or dues from the time the club was originally conceived, and everybody just kept doing the same thing.

In two thousand -- 2008/2009, the Anderson family decided that the Tower Club was not really part of their core holdings and they were uncomfortable continuing to own and operate it. So they went to Robert, Robert, Robert, French, Lopez who had been the -- originally the -- the head waiter and then maitre d and then general manager of the

Tower Club and asked him if he wanted to take over the operation. And at that point in time he was 67 or 68 years old and not ready to retire, loved his job and was concerned that if somebody else came in and took over, he might not have a job anymore. So he agreed to take over and insisted. At that point in time he was reporting to me. I was his supervisor. I knew nothing about his business, but he still had to report to me. He said -- he said I'd like to do it because I'm not ready to retire yet, but I am uncomfortable doing it by myself. So he says, I want you to be involved. And I said, Robert, I don't really want to, but I'll do it just to help you out, so we formed an LLC. He owned 90 percent, I owned 10 percent with no expectation of ever getting anything from it, other than just to be there to help him.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The rough economy, the fact that the club was isolated in an area where it was difficult to continue to attract members, not having the enormous personality of Bud Smith to kind of hold it together, membership started dropping off, so it no longer became -- and I told him when he took it over, I said, you have no financial liability. Don't put any of your own money into this business, don't let it take you down. When it got to the point where it was no longer profitable, he began talking to people about taking it over. Finally came across an individual who was a

member of the club whose business was running food and beverage operations at golf courses where he hoped to break even on -- on the food and beverage service at the golf course but would make profit on using the venue for banquets, because it's much easier to control your costs with a banquet where you have a fixed number of people that you know that are coming, you can staff it properly, much more profitable than -- than an a la carte restaurant business. So he was interested in taking an assignment of the lease, giving Robert some cash for -- for that. And Robert would stay involved for a couple of months and then he would be gone. So they concluded a transaction, Robert sold the business. Last day of business was February 15th of 2015.

Several months later, September 18th of 2015,
Robert contacted the -- the Department to cancel his retail
sales license. On September 22nd we get a notice from the
Department that they want to audit the Tower Club, City
Tower Club 2200. So we go through that process with them,
which took a substantial amount of time, and they came back
with their audit. I think what they were originally looking
for was probably some tax on the sale of the business and
transfer of assets. Since that wasn't there, they came up
with this tax on membership fees and began pursuing that,
because there was nothing else for them to get. We

explained to them at that point in time that what Robert received from the sale of the business was simply enough money to pay off his past due accounts, to pay his employees their wages and accrued vacation time, to pay his vendors, and at that point in time he had about 25,000 or \$28,000 left over.

The first thing we had to do when we got the notice that we owed \$98,000 or whatever it was was hire an attorney. \$12,000 later and no progress and no money. We stopped that and started attending the hearings on our own. The process at that point and always realizing that the people who were saying that this was correct and proper application of the tax were the same people that were collecting the tax and that we weren't really going anywhere. In the documentation that we received on the notice of determination the very first paragraph, it says, "LLC members are personally liable for taxes collected but not paid to the Department." So reading the extension of that, taxes that are not collected are not the personal responsibility of the individual LLC members.

At the conclusion of one of the meetings that we had with the staff down in Ventura and we pointed out we don't have any money, they said we can come after you personally. We'll get your personal assets. That makes this very personal both for Mr. Lopez who is 75 on his next

birthday, and I'm 72 years old. And we don't need this kind of burden hanging over our heads. We need to know where this is going and are we at risk. That's not what we anticipated. We never knew, we don't believe today that taxes are -- should be charged on membership fees and we hope you'll agree with us.

ALJ ANGEJA: Okay. Does that conclude your presentation?

THE APPELLANT: That concludes my presentation.

ALJ ANGEJA: I've got a potential question, but I'll wait. Do you want to let the Department go before yours?

ALJ GEARY: Yes, I will.

ALJ ANGEJA: All right. Any questions?

ALJ HOSEY: No.

ALJ ANGEJA: All right. CDTFA, go ahead and make your presentation.

MR. NOBLE: Under the Revenue and Taxation Code a retailer's sales of tangible personal property, such as food and beverages, are subject to tax measured by the retailer's gross receipts. Gross receipts are measured by the total sales price of the property, including services that are part of the sale without any deduction for labor, service costs or other expenses. It is presumed that all gross receipts are subject to tax until the contrary is established. Regulation 1584 addresses the application of

tax to membership fees and provides that membership fees related to anticipated sales of tangible personal property are part of a retailer's gross receipts when the property is only sold to members and the membership fee exceeds a nominal amount. However, charges for membership fees that are not related to anticipated sales of tangible personal property are not subject to tax.

In this appeal there is no dispute that only appellant's paid members and their guests could purchase food and beverages. In addition, there is no dispute that appellant's members -- membership fees exceeded a nominal amount.

As for whether the fees were related to anticipated sales of tangible personal property, appellant marketed itself as a private dinner club. For example, Exhibit C is screenshots of appellant's website describing the Tower Club as a sophisticated private member dinner club which provided a fine dining experience, exemplary service, and an outstanding wine list. Appellant's testimonial section of its website focused exclusively on the dining and service provided at the restaurant and banquet facility. Reviews for the Tower Club on TripAdvisor and Yelp attached as Exhibits A and B respectively are also consistent with appellant's website and focus on the restaurant and dining events. In addition, 70 percent of appellant's revenue was

derived from the sales of food and beverages while appellant provided access to a small approximate 12 by 12 foot gym and There is no evidence the purpose of the membership spa. fees were for the use of the gym and spa with only incidental sales of food and beverages. Rather in this appeal the evidence indicates that appellant's restaurant and its sales of food and beverages were the primary purpose for paying the membership fees. In other words, appellant's customers paid the membership fees to gain access to the restaurant and lounge so that they could purchase food and beverages and the services that were part of those sales. Therefore, the evidence establishes that appellant's membership fees were related to anticipated sales of tangible personal property and are subject to tax. That concludes your presentation? ALJ ANGEJA: MR. NOBLE: Yes, sir. All right. Would you like a rebuttal to ALJ ANGEJA: what he said? THE APPELLANT: I think he's, you know -- I don't know about the -- the measured by gross receipts. I don't see that anywhere in the regulation. I think the facts are pretty clear.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ALJ ANGEJA: Okay. I know my colleague has questions.

I just want to clarify one fact. There's no dispute that

I'm aware of that tax reimbursement was not collected.

MR. NOBLE: That is correct. I can't find any indication in the audit working papers anywhere, and I believe the decision also notes the membership fees -- there's no indication that they collected tax reimbursement on membership fees and failed to remit that to the State, so...

ALJ ANGEJA: So as I understand the law, and I don't know if you're going to be able to concede it, but I'd like to give an answer to his question. There cannot be personal liability, at least under Section 6829, because that's one of the crucial elements that's not met.

MR. NOBLE: Without speaking directly to the facts of this case, I -- I don't know if the Department can concede that or not. But, yes, that's exactly correct. The personal liability that he was talking about, one of the required elements is that sales tax reimbursement was collected on sales and then failed to be paid over to the State. So with regard to the membership fees here, because there's no evidence that they ever collected tax reimbursements on those sales, they could not be hold personally -- held personally liable under the Revenue and Taxation Code.

ALJ ANGEJA: You understand what he's saying?

THE APPELLANT: Yes.

ALJ ANGEJA: Okay. My colleague has some guestions.

1	You want to go ahead?
2	ALJ GEARY: Pronounce your last name for me again.
3	THE APPELLANT: It's like singer, only with a G,
4	Gienger.
5	ALJ GEARY: Gienger. Gienger?
6	THE APPELLANT: Gienger.
7	ALJ GEARY: Hard G? Okay. Mr. Gienger, tell me a
8	little bit about you haven't mentioned anything about the
9	property that I believe was supposed to be part of the club
10	operation but was located in the building next door that
11	housed a gym, a spa, and a tennis court if I'm not mistaken.
12	How did that property figure into this operation?
13	THE APPELLANT: The the gym/spa was on the same
14	floor as the restaurant.
15	ALJ GEARY: Oh, okay.
16	THE APPELLANT: And this this was on the 22nd floor
17	of the building. The tennis court was in the grounds
18	outside of the building.
19	ALJ GEARY: All right. And the gym/spa took up how
20	much space on that floor, if you can recall, approximately?
21	THE APPELLANT: Certainly certainly larger than 12
22	by 12, but less than 10 percent of the space.
23	ALJ GEARY: All right.
24	THE APPELLANT: Probably less than 5 percent of the
25	total space.

ALJ GEARY: And I gather from the information that I saw regarding how the club was marketed that it was considered to be a somewhat insubstantial part of the operation, that the operation was primarily as a dinner club for the members, including the lounge, for the members to dine and socialize; is that fair?

THE APPELLANT: That is. That is fair.

ALJ GEARY: Okay.

THE APPELLANT: But the, you know, the marketing of the club, our members came from other members more than anything else, just from -- from the website -- well -- well, we did that more to try to attract banquet people who were thinking about weddings and venues and those types of things and thinking, oh, I know so-and-so who's a member at the Tower Club, maybe they can sponsor us and we can have a wedding there. So we didn't get members from the website. We got members from other members.

ALJ GEARY: All right. Thank you.

ALJ ANGEJA: Does anybody else have any questions?

ALJ HOSEY: No. Thank you.

ALJ ANGEJA: No? All right. If the parties don't have additional questions, I think that concludes our hearing, and I would close the record and thank everybody for coming. That will conclude the hearing for today. Thank you.

MR. NOBLE: Thank you.

1	THE APPELLANT: Thank you.
2	ALJ HOSEY: Thank you.
3	ALJ ANGEJA: Sorry. I I forgot to indicate we have
4	a hundred days from today's date to issue the decision. I
5	know you heard that from watching Watkins, so
6	
7	(The proceedings concluded.)
8	000
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
2	COUNTY OF FRESNO )
3	
4	
5	I, Gracie E. Becerra, CSR No. 13136, a Certified
6	Shorthand Reporter in and for the County of Fresno, State of
7	California, do hereby certify:
8	I am the person who stenographically recorded the
9	Business Tax Appeal Hearing held on July 18, 2019.
10	The foregoing transcript is a true record of said
11	proceedings.
12	
13	
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my
15	name this <u>5th</u> day of <u>August</u> , 2019.
16	
17	
18	Gracie E. Becerra
19	CSR No. 13136
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	