1	HEARING	
2	OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS	
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
4		
5		
6	In the Matter of the Business	
7	Tax Appeals Hearing of:	
8	OTA Case No. 18083545	
9	MOUNT DIABLO TILE & STONE COMPANY,	
10	Appellant.	
11	/	
12		
13		
14		
15	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
16	TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2019	
17	11:06 A.M.	
18		
19	OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS 1400 R STREET	
20	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	REPORTED BY: PEGGY A. PORTER, RDR, RMR, CRR CSR No. 6086	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	PANEL LEAD:	
4	ALJ JEFF ANGEJA	
5		
6	PANEL MEMBERS:	
7	ALJ ANDREW KWEE	
8	ALJ AMANDA VASSIGH	
9		
10	APPEARING FOR TAXPAYER:	
11	AVI NAHMIAS, TAXPAYER	
12	SHAMRA REED	
13		
14	APPEARING FOR DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND FEE ADMINISTRATION:	
15	SCOTT LAMBERT, HEARING REPRESENTATIVE	
16	KEVIN HANKS, HEARING REPRESENTATIVE	
17	CHRISTOPHER BROOKS, TAX COUNSEL	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		2

1	- W 5 - W	
1	INDEX	
2		DAGE
3	TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2019	PAGE
4	PROCEEDINGS	4
5		
6		
7	EXHIBITS	
8	Exhibits A through H	(Marked prior
9		to proceedings.)
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		3

1 Tuesday, September 24, 2019, 11:06 a.m. Sacramento, California 3 4 ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. We will go on the record 5 for the appeal of Mount Diablo Tile & Stone. Case ID 6 is 1808 -- I'll wait for the video. Are you ready? 7 All right. For the appeal of Mt. Diablo Tile & 8 Stone. Case ID is 18083545. 9 Good morning, everybody. Thank you for coming. 10 We are in Sacramento, California. And the date is 11 Tuesday, September 24th, and the time is approximately 12 11:05. My name is Jeff Angeja and I'm the lead 13 administrative law judge for this hearing. 14 My fellow co-panelists today are Andrew Kwee 15 and Amanda Vassigh. 16 ALJ KWEE: Good morning. 17 ALJ VASSIGH: Good morning. 18 ALJ ANJEJA: And before I get too much further, 19 these mics do not turn off. They are sensitive. So it 20 will pick up whispers. That said, do please speak 21 directly into the mic when you speak. So feel free to 22 move it around so you're talking directly into it. 2.3 That way it gets on the video and the livestream and 24 our court reporter can accurately transcribe what we 25 say.

1 Appellant, could you please introduce yourself 2 for the record. 3 MR. NAHMIAS: Avi Nahmias with Mount Diablo 4 Tile & Stone. MS. REED: Shamra Reed with Mount Diablo Tile & 6 Stone. 7 ALJ ANJEJA: Can I get you to spell that? MS. REED: S-h-a-m-r-a. Reed is R-e-e-d. 8 9 ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. Thank you. 10 And for CDTFA? 11 MR. LAMBERT: Scott Lambert representing CDTFA. 12 And to my left is Chris Brooks. And to Mr. Brooks' 13 left is Kevin Hanks. 14 ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. Thank you. 15 This appeal involves two issues. Which are first whether reductions are warranted to the audited 16 17 amount of unreported taxable sales. And, two, whether 18 relief from the failure to file penalty for the fourth 19 quarter of 2014 is warranted. 20 During our prehearing conferences the parties 21 agreed to provide exhibits to each other and to OTA 22 before September 13th. We have Exhibits A through H 2.3 from CDTFA that were provided both to appellant as well 2.4 as to us.

5

I don't have any exhibits from appellant.

1	MR. NAHMIAS: No. I don't have anything.		
2	ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. Have you given them		
3	anything that you haven't given to us?		
4	MR. NAHMIAS: No.		
5	ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. Because I have no hearing		
6	record exhibits, I'm assuming well, okay. Whatever		
7	you need is in there, A through H?		
8	MR. NAHMIAS: Yeah.		
9	ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. And based on our prehearing		
10	conference, it's my understanding that, Mr. Nahmias,		
11	you will testify today. Is that still correct?		
12	MR. NAHMIAS: Yes.		
13	ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. So I'll swear you in in a		
14	bit.		
15	CDTFA has no witnesses?		
16	MR. LAMBERT: That's correct.		
17	ALJ ANJEJA: The distinction and for the		
18	benefit of the audience, your testimony will be sworn.		
19	We will be able to make factual findings based on your		
20	testimony. Theirs, because it's not witness testimony,		
21	it's just argument. So we can make factual findings on		
22	documentary evidence, exhibits, testimony, but not		
23	argument.		
24	And as we agreed during our prehearing		
25	conference, we'll begin with appellant's testimony and	6	
		J	

1	argument which should not exceed 20 minutes. CDTFA		
2	will then be allowed to ask questions, if they wish, as		
3	will the panel.		
4	And then CDTFA will make its presentation not		
5	to exceed 20 minutes. Appellant and the co-panelists		
6	can ask questions. And then we'll allow a five-minute		
7	rebuttal.		
8	All right. If there's no procedural questions,		
9	I'll start.		
10	And forgive me if I mispronounce the name.		
11	Mr. Nahmias, correct?		
12	MR. NAHMIAS: That's correct.		
13	ALJ ANJEJA: Okay.		
14	MR. NAHMIAS: The name is Nahmias. That's		
15	fine.		
16	ALJ ANJEJA: Nahmias. Okay. I will get that.		
17	Mr. Nahmias, please stand and raise your right		
18	hand.		
19	AVI NAHMIAS,		
20	was sworn by the administrative law judge to tell the		
21	truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth,		
22	ALJ ANJEJA: Thank you.		
23	Okay. Whenever you're ready, go ahead and		
24	begin.		
25	MR. NAHMIAS: Well 7		

1	ALJ ANJEJA: Speak into the microphone. Feel
2	free to pull it in front of you.
3	MR. NAHMIAS: I believe the Board of
4	Equalization is saying there's a past due on the sales
5	tax overdue. And the numbers that they have on their
6	record is the wrong amount.
7	The business had a fire and which burned all
8	the records and computers. So the only records I had
9	to give them was the tax returns that were filed prior
10	to the fire.
11	And pretty much, yeah, whatever they have in
12	records, that's how much I owe. They have a different
13	amount that I'm you know, I'm not too sure where
14	they got from.
15	And that's about it.
16	ALJ ANJEJA: That concludes your presentation?
17	MR. NAHMIAS: Yeah.
18	ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. I presume the panelists
19	have no questions?
20	ALJ VASSIGH: No questions.
21	ALJ ANJEJA: Go ahead.
22	ALJ KWEE: Just a matter of clarification.
23	I understand from one of the exhibits that you
24	were requesting an adjustment for non-taxable sales for
25	resale to three purchasers; Portofino, La Castellan

1	I'm not sure if I pronounced that correctly and to
2	Coliseum Title Tile; is that correct?
3	MR. NAHMIAS: That was that was sales orders
4	that took place, yeah, to a wholesaler, yes.
5	ALJ KWEE: Okay. So in the exhibit index I see
6	sales invoices to Portofino and sales invoices to La
7	Castellan, but I don't see any sales invoices to
8	Coliseum Tile. Is
9	MR. NAHMIAS: That's the same company. Same
10	location.
11	ALJ KWEE: Oh.
12	MR. NAHMIAS: And they kept changing their
13	names. So it's the same company.
14	ALJ KWEE: Okay.
15	MR. NAHMIAS: Same address. Just same same
16	owners.
17	ALJ KWEE: Were there any resale certificates
18	that were provided with these sales invoices, or is it
19	just the sales invoices that you
20	MR. NAHMIAS: I $$ I gave them the resale
21	numbers as well from those companies.
22	ALJ KWEE: Okay. Thank you.
23	ALJ ANJEJA: CDTFA, would you like to make your
24	presentation?
25	MR. LAMBERT: Sure.
	9

In this particular case, the taxpayer is a retailer of -- mainly a retailer of flooring materials.

2.3

Originally how the audit was initiated is one of the corporate officers filed the complaint with our investigation division in regards to the taxpayer deleting sales out of their point of sales system. And so that's how this audit was initiated.

So the taxpayer was contacted for audit. And they requested three weeks in order to gather the records together.

In that time, about two and a half weeks in, there was a fire where apparently all the records or most of the records were destroyed. So there were limited records in which to conduct the audit.

So we did have the income tax returns for 2011, 2012 and 2013. It appeared that the amounts reported on the income tax returns for 2012 and 2013 appeared reasonable based on our — or the 1099 information, which is the credit card receipts.

So based on a ratio between that and what was reported, we essentially accepted the sales reported on the income tax returns for 2012 and 2013 as being the true sales of the business.

For the fourth quarter of 2011, because dividing up the income tax return by four for that

period was less than the credit card receipts for the fourth quarter of 2011, we used a — the credit card ratio method in order to establish the liability for the fourth quarter of '11.

2.3

For 2014, we used the average quarterly sales from the 2013 period. And also for the first quarter of 2014 we used the average for the 2013 daily sales as the business was only open until February 7th of 2015 for that year.

So we added up all those figures and we came to \$3,084,000 rounded. We made an adjustment for resales. The appellant was able to provide us with sales invoices for that period of time and it added up to \$776,000, which we made an adjustment for. We did not have any resale cards for that period.

And also the 776 includes sales to the three customers in question that were mentioned earlier. And that was \$658,000. So we did make an adjustment for 658 based on those three customers.

There was also another adjustment that we made and that was for installation labor. The appellant had provided us with invoices of purchases of labor where another person had installed materials that they were selling. We marked that up 10 percent and it came to 300 — just under 301,000.

So we subtracted the resales and installation labor from the total sales that we had established to come up with the audited taxable sales of \$2,006,000. We subtracted that from what was reported, which was \$382,000 and we came up with a difference of \$1.624 million.

2.3

2.4

So after the appeals conference, the appellant had provided us with additional resales invoices and he had indicated that he had received those from the three customers in question, which was Coliseum Title (sic), La Castellan, and Portofino Tile & floors.

So in this instance we decided to contact the representatives from that company. And the response we got back from La Castellan, the manager stated that he did not provide the invoices to the appellant or couldn't remember doing that, which would I would point out would had to have been only a couple months before we had contacted him. They also stated it wasn't reasonable for them to make large purchases with such high dollar amounts.

Now, I will point you to our exhibit. And I'll use 100, Exhibit 100. And if you take a look at that exhibit --

ALJ KWEE: I'm sorry. Exhibit 100 or page 100?

MR. LAMBERT: Page 100 of Exhibit C. So I

1 should have said page 100 of Exhibit C. Or maybe --2 well, that's our Bates stamp number that's on the 3 bottom of the page. Are you able to follow --4 5 ALJ ANJEJA: That's an invoice for --MR. LAMBERT: It's an invoice, yes. 6 7 ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. 8 MR. LAMBERT: So what I'd point you to is the 9 dollar amount. It's for 4,560 square feet. And if you 10 look all the way to the right, it has a dollar amount 11 and then it has a T after that. And what that 12 generally indicates is that that's a taxable amount. 13 So the owners -- the owner of Coliseum Tile 14 indicated that the invoices that we provided to him 15 appeared to be bogus. And this is kind of an indicator 16 when it has a T on there. It generally means that it's 17 a taxable item. But if you look down, there is no 18 sales tax on this. 19 So essentially we did not accept the additional 20 resale invoices that were provided to us. There was no 21 resale certificate that was provided to us. 22 So we did accept -- we had already accepted a 2.3 large percentage of the sales to Portofino. So that 24 was \$195,000 that we had already accepted in our

initial review of the invoices. And based on this

information, it's quite possible that we shouldn't have accepted that. But in fact we did.

2.3

We have — if you look at Exhibit B, Bates stamp 65, that is our memo that explains how we went out afterwards and contacted the individuals that were associated with the customers and the results from that.

I would also refer you to Exhibit A, page 12. And the date at the bottom, the entry at the bottom, which is July 9th, 2015. If you look at the second to last sentence of that entry — and they're talking to Lily Novoa.

She's — this — it states, "The auditor asked her about resale information. She mentioned the resale should not be material for the business."

So she's indicating that they do not have a material amount of resale transactions.

In regards to the failure to file penalty.

There was — the fourth quarter of 2014 was not filed timely. The return was due January 31st, 2015. The fire took place after the return was due and therefore that penalty remained.

The first quarter of 2015 return was also not filed timely. But due to the fire, the department did remove that failure to file penalty.

1	So, accordingly, I'm available for any
2	questions.
3	ALJ KWEE: I have a question. It looks like
4	one of your decisions indicates this audit was referred
5	from the investigation bureau. And I guess I was
6	curious about that.
7	Was there evidence that they were using sales
8	suppression devices or software in this case?
9	MR. LAMBERT: Other than the complaint that was
10	made, we don't have any evidence. And I would point
11	out before we were able to look at the computers, they
12	were destroyed.
13	So we never had an opportunity to review that.
14	ALJ KWEE: Okay. So this case doesn't involve
15	any criminal charges or anything like that?
16	MR. LAMBERT: That's correct.
17	ALJ KWEE: Okay.
18	MR. LAMBERT: It does not. This is a civil
19	matter.
20	ALJ KWEE: I did have a question for the
21	taxpayers.
22	Are you the president of the corporation?
23	MR. NAHMIAS: Yes.
24	ALJ KWEE: So then in the decision and
25	recommendation or the decision on the Exhibit F for 15
	10

CDTFA it states that an investor in the business stated that petitioner's president was making and subsequently deleting sales from the firm's point of sale system to underreport taxable sales.

2.3

And I'm just wondering if you could briefly address that or if you have a response to that contention.

MR. LAMBERT: Lily Novoa was my partner effective April 27, 2012. She joined the company on that date. And since the first few months, we both realized it was a bad partnership. And it was going downhill since that day.

I was trying to run a business with, you know, a lot of wholesalers and designers that bought stuff from us. It wasn't the majority retail. It was more of a wholesale and a designer place in Walnut Creek right on the main — Mt. Diablo Boulevard.

So it was a really small little hole in the wall pretty much, a thousand square feet. So it wasn't, you know, a big exposure to clients. So we dealt with a lot of designers.

And Lily Novoa, I found out probably five months through the audit that she actually did call in I guess the complaint just out of spite of the partnership.

And yeah, it was real bad. It was — it was — yeah, it was an eye opener for me. It was an experience I'll never want to remember. It was just a horrible three and a half years that we were together.

2.3

As far as for the invoice that you said were the taxable, we used a QuickBooks program. And on some occasions if it's not checked out, the T by the dollar amount, it will show taxable or non-taxable.

But when it's a wholesale like Coliseum or La Castellan or another company, there's a bracket on the bottom that shows no sales tax, because it's a resale. So it doesn't matter whether the T if it's there for tax or non-tax. It's irrelevant.

With the QuickBooks, if we have a resale number, you enter it under non-taxable. That's why there's no tax on that invoice. So the T, it's probably just — it was checked by accident or checked off by accident. I'm not too sure.

And one more thing. Lily Novoa, throughout the whole partnership used to take the computers home with her and bring them back on Monday. I'm not sure what she did. You know, I texted her, I called her, you know.

Every Monday she'd go there in a timely manner to open the shop and she's not there till like 1, 2

o'clock with the computers. So I'm not sure exactly what she did with the invoicing or the sales tax.

2.3

She's the one that actually did do the sales tax online when we actually paid the stuff quarterly. So she's the one that filed the stuff off the QuickBooks, taxable, what to do. And that's how we paid the sales tax.

So whatever the amounts they have over there,
I'm not sure how they came up with. From her
paperwork, I'm not sure. Because I gave the Board of
Equalization my tax returns, my personal tax returns,
and the business.

So the amount of money they're talking about doesn't make sense as far as for sales tax and money that we made. So yeah. So, you know, like I said, I'm not sure what Lily did with the business, with the computers while, you know, she had them in her possession over the weekends.

And like I said there's an employee over here with me, Shamra Reed. She witnessed what's going on for the past three years. And, you know, if you want to ask questions, you're more than welcome. But that's what happened.

And as far as for their numbers, the only thing that I do know that we owe is that last quarter prior

to the fire. It was during the holidays, the last 1 2 quarter. Business was very slow and Lily Novoa was 3 withdrawing all the money out prior to the holidays. So as far as for the sales tax for that fourth quarter, 4 5 I know the company does owe it. And for the first -- the first for 2013 -- oh, 6 7 no, 2000 -- right after the fire, that first quarter, 8 yeah, nothing was filed because everything was burned. 9 I couldn't figure out what's owed and what's not owed. 10 So the same, you know, when I did my taxes, my 11 federal and state, I gave them all the paperwork and 12 they just zeroed it out for, you know, no earnings at 13 all for that first quarter. 14 ALJ KWEE: Okay. One more question. 15 So it looks like the fire was in February '15 16 and the close-out of the corporation was also in 17 February of '15. Did the business close out because of 18 the fire or terminate business because of the fire? MR. NAHMIAS: Yeah. We closed the business 19 after the fire. It would cost -- I mean it would take 20 21 almost six months to relocate to find a new place. 22 I just didn't want to stay in that same partnership so 2.3 we just dissolved everything. 24 Quick question for CDTFA. ALJ KWEE: 25 Has there been any 6829 responsible person

1 billing in this case? 2 MR. LAMBERT: Not that I'm aware of. 3 ALJ KWEE: Okay. I don't think I have any 4 further questions. Thank you. 5 ALJ VASSIGH: I have no questions. ALJ ANJEJA: For the benefit of the court 6 7 reporter, the name that we're referring to, Lily Novoa, 8 L-i-l-y, last name is N-o-v-o-a. Is that correct? 9 MR. NAHMIAS: Yes. 10 ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. 'Cause we're all saying it 11 very quickly so I want to make sure. 12 I don't believe that I have any additional 13 questions. I haven't given you the opportunity do a 14 rebuttal, but it seems like you gave one in the answer 15 to his question. 16 But that said, I want to make sure you get the 17 last word and have a five-minute rebuttal, if you'd 18 like, before we close the record. 19 MR. NAHMIAS: As far as I would say that CDTFA 20 has the paperwork that I sent over which shows that 21 she's 50 percent owner of the property. And, you know, 22 how come she's not involved in the whole audit and the 2.3 hearing as well? 24 MS. REED: And who made the complaint. 25 Lily make the complaint?

1 MR. NAHMIAS: Yes. ALJ ANJEJA: We need to -- one at a time and we 3 need to have you speak into the microphone. 4 MS. REED: I wanted to know who made the 5 complaint. And where is Lily. Because everyday that 6 she would come in, she would come in late. She wasn't 7 She was stressing out about money. She made lots of threats. She was violent towards Avi. 8 And she was a new owner. She really had --10 she'd never been in the tile business before. 11 believe she has her contractor's license, but didn't 12 know how to figure out square footage. 13 ALJ ANJEJA: So I'll sort of answer on your 14 behalf. You've already identified Ms. Novoa as the 15 complainant, correct? 16 MR. LAMBERT: That's correct. 17 ALJ ANJEJA: That was the tip that you got. 18 MR. LAMBERT: That's right. 19 ALJ ANJEJA: I can't speak for Ms. Novoa, but 20 the billing that they've issued is to the corporation 21 rather than to an individual. So you're representing 22 the corporation. 2.3 I would say she's got the same right to be here 24 as you do, but it's your company. So presumably if the 25 partnership's terminated, she's out of the picture.

1 But they haven't issued a determination against her as an individual. So that's my speculation as to 2 3 why she's not here. MS. REED: So she wouldn't be responsible for 4 5 50 percent of what went on? Or -- I'm kind of 6 confused. Because if she was part partner, I mean --7 ALJ ANJEJA: Right now, with what they have said, is that they've not issued an individual billing 8 9 to anybody for this case. It's only as to the 10 corporation. So not only not as to her, but not as to 11 you. 12 Okay. Did you have more for rebuttal? You had 13 that question. 14 MR. NAHMIAS: No. Pretty much, you know, like 15 I said before, he has all the business income tax and 16 federal tax, my personal taxes that shows that the 17 place was not making any money, losing money on a 18 monthly basis. Barely making ends meet. 19 So yeah, so this figure that he's talking about, you know, 1.2, it just doesn't make sense to me 20 21 at all. And, you know, like I said, I'm not sure what 22 2.3 the numbers, you know, Lily gave them an indication 24 with the -- with this outrageous sales tax -- I mean

the sales, it just doesn't -- doesn't make sense.

1	ALJ ANJEJA: Okay. If there's no questions	
2	from my panel	
3	ALJ VASSIGH: No questions.	
4	ALJ ANJEJA: I think then that we will close	
5	the record and we will conclude this hearing.	
6	I'd like to thank each party for coming in	
7	today. Following this hearing, my co-panelists and I	
8	will discuss the evidence and argument and then we will	
9	issue a written opinion within 100 days.	
10	Thank you. And this hearing is now closed.	
11	MR. LAMBERT: Thank you.	
12	(The proceedings concluded at 11:32 a.m.)	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	23	

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
2	I, PEGGY A. PORTER, do hereby certify:	
3	That the said proceeding was taken before me at	
4	the said time and place, and was taken down in	
5	shorthand writing by me;	
6	That I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the	
7	State of California;	
8	That the said proceeding was thereafter, under	
9	my direction, transcribed into computer-assisted	
10	transcription; and that the foregoing transcript	
11	constitutes a full, true, and correct report of the	
12	proceedings which then and there took place; that I am	
13	a disinterested person to the said action.	
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed	
15	my hand this 7th day of November 2019.	
16		
17	PEGGY A. PORTER, CSR 6086	
18	,	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	24	