BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ΙN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF,)			
J.	GOLI	DSTEIN,)	OTA	NO.	20025885
				Al	PPELLAN'	Γ.)			
)			

TRANSCRIPT OF VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Wednesday, September 29, 2021

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,)) J. GOLDSTEIN,) OTA NO. 20025885
7)
8	APPELLANT.))
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Transcript of Virtual Proceedings,
15	taken in the State of California, commencing
16	at 9:32 a.m. and concluding at 11:36 a.m. on
17	Wednesday, September 29, 2021, reported by
18	Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter, in and
19	for the State of California.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

I		
1	APPEARANCES:	
2	m ramamodo.	
3	Panel Lead:	ALJ JOSHUA ALDRICH
4	Panel Members:	ALJ ANDREW WONG
5	ranei Mempeis:	ALJ SHERIENE RIDENOUR
6	For the Appellant:	WARREN NEMIROFF J. GOLDSTEIN
7		
8	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND
9		FEE ADMINISTRATION
10		JOSEPH BONIWELL CARY HUXSOLL
11		JASON PARKER
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	<u>INDEX</u>						
2							
3	<u>EXHIBITS</u>						
4							
5	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-20 were received at page 9.)						
6	(Department's Exhibits A-CC were received at page 9)						
7							
8	APPELLANT'S						
9	<u>WITNESSES:</u> <u>DIRECT</u> <u>CROSS</u> <u>REDIRECT</u> <u>RECROSS</u>						
10	James Goldstein 10						
11							
12	<u>WITNESS TESTIMONY</u>						
13	<u>PAGE</u>						
14	By James Goldstein 26						
15							
16							
17	<u>PRESENTATION</u>						
18	<u>PAGE</u>						
19	By Mr. Boniwell 48						
20							
21	CLOSING STATEMENT						
22	<u>PAGE</u>						
23	By Mr. Nemiroff 81						
24							
25							

California; Wednesday, September 29, 2021 9:32 a.m.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE ALDRICH: This is Josh Aldrich. We're opening the record in James Eugene Goldstein before the Office of Tax Appeals, OTA Case Number 20025885. Today's date is Wednesday, September 29th, 2021, and the time is approximately 9:32 a.m. This hearing is noticed for a virtual hearing with the agreement of the parties.

Today's hearing is being heard by three

Administrative Law Judges. My name is Josh Aldrich, and

I'm the lead judge for purposes of conducting the hearing.

At this point I'd like my co-panelists to introduce themselves, beginning with Judge Andrew Wong.

JUDGE WONG: Good morning this is Judge Wong.

JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you.

And Judge Sheriene Ridenour.

JUDGE RIDENOUR: Good morning. This is Judge Ridenour.

JUDGE ALDRICH: We three will deliberate and decide the issues presented. Any panel member may ask questions or otherwise participate to ensure that we have all the information needed to decide this appeal. I would like to remind today's participants and viewers that the Office of Tax Appeals is not a court. We are an

1 independent appeals body. We do not engage in ex parte 2 communications with either party. Our opinion will be 3 based on the parties' arguments, the admitted evidence, and the relevant law. We have read the parties' 4 5 submissions, and we are looking forward to hearing your 6 arguments today. 7 For Appellant I believe we have attorney Warren Nemiroff --8 9 MR. NEMIROFF: Yeah. 10 JUDGE ALDRICH: -- as well as Appellant 11 Mr. Goldstein. And that's correct? 12 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. 13 MR. NEMIROFF: Yes. 14 JUDGE ALDRICH: All right. And for Respondent 15 for the Department, I believe we have Joseph Boniwell, Tax 16 Counsel III, Cary C. Huxsoll, Tax Counsel IV, and Jason 17 Parker Chief of Headquarters Operations for the 18 Department; is that correct? 19 MR. BONIWELL: This is Joseph Boniwell, and 20 that's correct. 21 JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. So the issues to be 22 decided today or in our opinion that's issued 23 subsequently, rather, is whether James Goldstein is 2.4 personally liable as a responsible person pursuant to 25 Revenue & Taxation Code Section 6829 for the unpaid sales

1 tax liabilities of National Imaging Company or NIC, doing 2 business as Reseda Mobil Incorporated for the remaining 3 disputed period of July 11th, 2005, through April 24th, It's undisputed that NIC ceased business activities 4 5 on April 24th, 2007. It's also undisputed that sales tax 6 reimbursement was collected by NIC. 7 Revenue & Taxation Code Section 6829(b), 8 responsible person remains at issue, and Revenue & 9 Taxation Code 6829(a) and (d), willfulness, remains at 10 issue. Also, whether adjustments are warranted to NIC's 11 unpaid sales tax liabilities, whether the imposition of 12 the fraud penalty against NIC was warranted, and whether 13 relief from the late prepayment and finality penalties 14 against NIC are warranted. Mr. Nemiroff, is that correct? 15 16 MR. NEMIROFF: That's correct. 17 JUDGE ALDRICH: And Department? 18 MR. BONIWELL: This is Joseph Boniwell, and

that's correct.

JUDGE ALDRICH: All right. Regarding witnesses, we have Mr. Goldstein as a witness, and the Department will not be calling any witnesses.

Is that correct, Mr. Nemiroff?

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

MR. NEMIROFF: That's correct.

JUDGE ALDRICH: And Department?

MR. BONIWELL: This is Joseph Boniwell, and that's correct.

JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. I'd like to go ahead and

swear in the witness.

When you're ready, Mr. Goldstein, could you please raise your right hand.

J. GOLDSTEIN,

produced as a witness, and having been first duly sworn by the Administrative Law Judge, was examined and testified as follows:

2.1

2.4

JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you.

Next, we'll discuss exhibits. The Department exhibits are identified as A through BB, and Appellant's exhibits are identified as 1 through 19. These exhibits were admitted into the record pursuant to our September 9th, 2021, minutes and orders without objections from either party. Exhibit CC was subsequently submitted timely by the Department, with updated liabilities, and Appellant resubmitted a timely signed statement under penalty of perjury, which we'll label as Exhibit 20.

Is there any objection to admitting CC and Exhibit 20 into evidence, Appellant's Counsel?

MR. NEMIROFF: No.

JUDGE ALDRICH: And Department? 1 2 MR. BONIWELL: This is Joseph Boniwell. No 3 objection. JUDGE ALDRICH: 4 Thank vou. 5 So Exhibits A through CC for Department are 6 admitted, and Exhibits 1 through 20 for Appellant are 7 admitted. (Appellant's Exhibits 1-20 were received 8 in evidence by the administrative Law Judge.) 10 (Department's Exhibits A-CC were received in 11 evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 12 To give you an idea of how this hearing will proceed, we plan for the hearing to proceed as follows: 13 14 Appellant's opening statement, which we estimated at 75 minutes. During that time, Appellant's witness will 15 16 provide testimony under oath. Next, the Department will 17 present a combined opening and closing for approximately 18 25 minutes. Appellant will then have 15 minutes to 19 present a closing statement or to rebut Department's 20 argument. 21 Please note that the Department may ask questions 22 of the witness, and the panel may ask questions of either 23 party or the witness. Does anyone have questions at this 2.4 point before we proceed to presentations?

Mr. Nemiroff?

25

1 MR. NEMIROFF: No, I do not. 2 JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. And Department? 3 MR. BONIWELL: This is Joseph Boniwell. I don't 4 have any questions. Thank you. 5 JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you. 6 This is Judge Aldrich. Mr. Nemiroff, when you're 7 ready, please proceed with your presentation. 8 MR. NEMIROFF: Your Honor -- Your Honors, I would 9 like to waive opening statement and get right into 10 questioning the witness myself at the present time. JUDGE ALDRICH: Please proceed. 11 12 MR. NEMIROFF: All right. 13 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. NEMIROFF: 15 16 Mr. Goldstein, you're there? 17 Yes, I am. Α 18 All right. Before you worked at the gas station, 0 19 what was your profession and roughly your income? 20 I owned a jewelry store off Ventura Boulevard. 2.1 Income at that time was seasonal. So, you know, it was, 22 you know, maybe around 30, \$40,000. It was a tough time 23 in the jewelry business. So income was, you know, not 2.4 where we would like to see it back then, but it was a 25 struggling business, a lot of compensation on Ventura

Boulevard.

2.4

Q So you weren't doing very well?

A No. I was struggling a little bit.

Q All right. How did you meet the principal, the one who settled with the State?

A So his wife was a customer at my jewelry store, and she had come in to design a ring. So I was working with her, and she kept talking about her husband. And he wanted to -- they just moved here from Chicago. And they were looking to make new friends. And, you know, she thought I would have things in common with her husband. So when the order was finalized, I had called her to come pick up the order, and she had brought her husband and introduced me to him, and we got talking.

And, you know, he came back a couple of days later, and we had lunch and talked about, you know, different thing. And we had a few things in common. I mean, we both wanted to, you know, do more things in our lives and make more money. But he was struggling also because he was just new in the area and didn't know really anybody. So I introduced him to people, and we became friends. And that's how it started.

Q Well, why did he need your help at a gas station?

A So after, you know, being friends for, you know, I would say six months to a year, he decided he wanted to

buy this gas station. And I was still going through the roller coaster ride in my jewelry business. And he's in the Army Reserve, so he can get called on duty for two, three months at a time and come back. And so, you know, he wanted somebody that he can trust, you know, help with running the business for him.

2.1

2.4

He approached me on that and, you know, he had known that I was struggling a little bit in the jewelry business and asked me if I would want to help, you know, work in a gas station. Which, you know, wasn't something I really wanted to do, but it really was very helpful at the time. Because, you know, making \$500 a week back then was -- and my rent at the jewelry store was \$1,500 a month.

So it almost ensured that I could keep my business going. So I did it for my business more than his business because that income was going to help me out at that time. And I was a single guy but, you know, I was always really devoted to business. And, you know, I'm a very honest individual, and I've never -- you know, I ran that business with honesty, integrity, and passion. You know, I wanted to be successful. So I was trying all angles to make it work.

Q Well, what position did he offer you at the gas station?

A So he needed, you know, somebody to oversee the employees, to hire and fire employees, to make sure that they're on schedule coming there on time. And the thing I liked about it is I can do that earlier. My store didn't open until 10:00 o'clock in the morning. And I was closed on Mondays at the store, so that allowed me morning time to be able to address gas station stuff.

2.1

2.4

So I would go at 7:00, 7:30 in the morning, something like that. I would make sure that, you know, the procedures and everything was being done. He kind of put a system together of it running, and I kind of oversaw that system on how it was being run on a daily basis.

Even though he was still in control over, you know, he had a laptop with cameras in the gas station. So he can oversee what was going on anywhere he was at. So we would talk every day.

He would tell me what his concerns were, if he saw something happening on the night before on the night shift because it was open 24 hours. So, you know, what to do and how to handle it and things like that. So he needed a body there when he was gone was mostly the reason why he asked me to help him.

Q But you ended up getting into a position where it looked like you were the responsible party?

A I did. And, you know, it's -- in hindsight I

wish I knew then what I know now. But I was very naive in putting myself in a position that I didn't understand.

Really, I thought I was helping a friend out to save a business. I didn't realize --

Q Well, why did he put you in that position?

A It was the only way to save his business at the time to keep it going.

Q Why?

2.1

2.4

A So he got caught kiting checks, which I knew nothing about. I didn't know what that even meant at the time. We got a letter -- he got a letter. He showed it to me, and they were telling him that he had to close the accounts within 60 days. So he said, you know, if I could put you on the corporation, then you can open an account and be a signer there and save the business for me. And then I'll work out the logistics and, you know, take it all -- you know, change it when -- you know, I don't know if there was a time period where you're on Check Systems and it goes away, or how it really works.

But he told me that he would work on it and figure out a way to, you know, get the accounts and everything back in his name. And so at that particular time, you know, the accountant showed up with a piece of paper. And it looked like a corporate paper that wasn't filled in yet. She asked me to sign it. I trusted the

accountant. I'd known her before her working at the station.

I introduced Nick to the accountant lady. She was a friend of mine from before. So I trusted what she was doing. And I never saw those complete documents, because for two years I signed a blank document that she gave me to be put as an officer on the corporation. The first time I saw --

Q Well, did the oil company know this was going on?

A No. No. The oil company wouldn't approve something like that. There's a process with the oil companies to be a partner or even an owner of a station. It's a long --

Q So -- so according to the oil company. You weren't the responsible party?

A No. No. I never was the responsible party according to Mobil.

Q Only he was?

A Only he was. Only he can be because it's a big qualification to become a dealer for Mobil. It's not anybody can do it.

Q Okay. So were you told by him that this was going to be only for a short period of time?

A Yes.

2.1

Q And what made it longer than his original

promise?

2.1

2.4

A Well, he was gone for a while and then he became ill. And when he became ill it was from overly drinking. He had an alcoholic problem. I, as a friend, was being patient. I didn't really want to do it anymore, but I was being patient. And I really liked the staff that we had working there, and I wanted to make sure that they were all okay. And that's what kept me doing it for longer than I wanted to do it.

But it wasn't something that I really wanted to do. I kind of got stuck after a while, and I couldn't just walk away until towards the end before he closed. I had no choice. I just had to because I -- I was feeling -- I was feeling very confused about what was going on.

- Q Did you ever sign a contract?
- 17 A No.
 - Q Did he ever tell you what your exposure was for doing this?

A He never told me what the exposure was. Because in my mind set, just being put on a corporation isn't going to make me an owner of a business. I didn't know that I would be responsible for taxes or anything else. Every single --

Q The accountant never tells you that?

A No. And, you know, he was paying taxes on a regular basis. I think the issue here was he wasn't paying enough taxes. So when you're in my shoes and you're seeing the taxes being paid every single month and, you know, the majority of the taxes directly taken by Mobil on credit card. So you don't see the majority of the tax. You're just paying the cash difference that you collect of taxes.

So in that regard, I never felt like there was anything to worry about or that I had to look into anything because everything seemed to be running pretty smooth. And it was helping me out, you know, making a couple of thousand dollars a month to, kind of, assure the rent in my jewelry store. So that's -- you know, I didn't have that knowledge. I didn't really --

- Q How did you get paid?
- A He paid me with a check, you know, every week, \$500 a week.
 - Q He gave you \$500 a week?
 - A Yes.

2.4

- Q Okay. And for how many years?
- A I believe it was almost three years, like, shy of three years.
- Q Okay. Did the oil company ever call you and say, "What are you doing on these minutes?"

A No. No.

2.1

2.4

Q So they never knew what was going on?

A No, I don't believe so. And if they did, they would have called him, not me.

Q Okay. All right. What are you doing -- when did you leave the oil company? When did you leave the station?

A I left right after I saw that he -- he needed -- when the audit came, he showed me the paper from the State Board. It was addressed to him and --

Q Not to you?

A Not to me. It was addressed to him, and it was for these time periods of audit. And he said, you know, what do you think we should do here? You know, what would you do? I said, well, personally because it's a lot -- you know, three years of auditing, talk to the accountant and see how, you know, you can go about this. So he talked to the accountant. She referred him to a lady that just handles audits. She's a professional in this audit stuff.

He took all the documents and records to her, and paid her, I believe it was 5 or \$6,000 to do this procedure; to also get, you know, in contact with the State Board so they can have a meeting together on this audit and come to a conclusion with it. When I left was

when a time has gone by, and I'm kind of waiting to see what's happening with this, you know, going on.

And I'm still conducting what I have to do with my responsibilities, and I hadn't heard from him. I called him a couple of times. He didn't call me back. So I called the lady that he had hired to do the auditing.

And she had told me, "He came and picked up all the books and records and fired me." That's --

Q Fired you?

2.4

- A He fired her from the --
- Q He fired her?

A Yes. And so that's when I decided -- you know, I got a hold of him and I said, so why would you do that and not, you know, work with the State Board? You paid this lady. And he says, "It's not your problem. It's not your business. You have nothing to do with this. You know, I don't answer to you or, you know, I'm hiring an attorney. And I'm not paying the State Board a dime on this."

And that was my last day. I stopped going in after that.

Q And when was that?

A So I believe it was maybe two or three weeks after he received that letter, whenever that letter was dated. I don't remember the exact date, but I remember that process because I had a knot in my stomach that, you

know, something didn't feel right about all this. And I believe several weeks or a couple of months later or maybe a month later, I got the same letter with my name on it.

And that's when, you know, I got, you know, really, you know, scared and frightened because I didn't know how to handle a situation like that.

I called the State Board directly. I went to the Van Nuys office. I sat with a couple of gentlemen there, explained to them my position that, you know, why I was put on the corporation. And I -- and they told me, you know, we'll get back to you. And, you know, and, you know, I went through the whole, you know, process with the hearing that we did prior to this.

O Yes.

2.1

2.4

A And when that hearing had happened, you know, I was sick. I had diverticulitis. I had over a 101 temperature. But I was so -- this has been the hardest thing in my life to deal with, and it's been going on for so long. It -- it -- it -- I just wanted to get it over with, whatever, you know happened. But it was really strenuous on me because I've never owed any kind of money to the State Board, IRS, or anything like that. I've always been a straight shooter. I'm not a criminal of any sort. I've never committed fraud or any of those kinds of things in my life.

That's not who I am or what I'm about. But being put in that position was very, very hard on me, being responsible for this. But at the time of the hearing, I -- you know, I showed up. My attorney, Mr. Nemiroff, was there. We presented the case and about three quarters down the road of the case, they stopped the hearing and told me that Mr. Moore had his attorney call at the hearing there and talking about settlement.

2.1

2.4

So I figured at that point that, you know, the settlement was happening. They didn't tell us anything about the settlement. They didn't tell us any -- what the settlement was or how it was going to be done or anything. So they just said, you know, to wait and see what happens with the settlement. And I think three or four years went by, and I'm thinking to myself -- because he had always assured me this was his problem, his station, his deal. It wasn't mine, that he was taking care of the situation.

I figured the settlement was taking care of the obligation until, like, I think four years later. I got another letter and talked to Warren about it, and here we are today.

Q At that hearing, were you told for the first time that he was settling with the State?

A Yes, I was. And, you know, I had two Board members at that hearing come up to me afterwards. They

told me that they felt like I was a patsy there, that I did a good job with the hearing. They didn't believe in their hearts that I was really a responsible person for this, that they were glad he had called to settle the situation. And they shook my hand. And I -- in my heart I felt like it was, you know, over because he was settling.

Q And what time -- do you remember the year of that hearing?

A I believe it was -- was it 2000? I think we have it somewhere. Is it 2012?

Q Yeah. So it's been a long, long time?

A Yes. And this has been hanging over my head. I can't tell you how stressful and I -- Warren, you know how stressful it's been for me.

Q Yeah.

2.1

2.4

A I mean, this is --

Q Have you gone through a bankruptcy because of this?

A I've gone through a bankruptcy, yes. And that was -- you know, also the jewelry store was, you know, not doing well. The economy was changing. You know, it was a -- it was a tough time, and this was added to that kind of stress on me. I went through a very life changing stuff there. And I'm sure everybody has in their life at

some point or another, but it just seems like for me it's been going on now for -- since 2008 until now.

2.4

And I'm the kind of guy that if I felt responsible, and if I did something wrong here, I don't care what the price would be. I would pay the price because I felt -- because I didn't do -- I didn't have control of anything. It wasn't my business. It wasn't my paperwork that I can control. If that was my business, would I let this guy just take it and go to an accountant?

It, you know, it doesn't make sense. Even the State Board investigation, so interviewing the accountants and interviewing people that were a part of this case that, you know, all, you know, different facts that, you know, the State Board came up with that proves that I wasn't in charge. You know, they have in their own statement that he went to the accountant, and they interviewed her. He took the paperwork and fired her. You know, that was from their -- the State Board's investigation. That wasn't just something I had said. And --

Q And that accountant never represented you; right?

A No. And that accountant there, she -- you know, when I had talked to her and asked her what was going on, and I asked her did she, you know, finalized figures. She said she was close. There was about a \$60,000 difference

1 for the three years of the audit. And she couldn't 2 understand why he did what he did with firing her, taking 3 all the paperwork, and disappearing. That's where we're at, you know. It's -- it's 4 5 gut wrenching to know that you could owe this amount of 6 money when it -- I -- it -- that would just ruin me, 7 especially, at this point. Let me ask you this question. What does the 8 Q 9 State say you owe for this onerous job you took on? 10 I believe it's in the 300 and some-odd thousand dollars. It's for --11 12 \$300,000 or more? Q. Over. Over \$300,000 with penalties, and I 13 14 believe fraud is in there. And I think there --15 JUDGE ALDRICH: Can I pause you there? Just --16 sorry. 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah. 18 JUDGE ALDRICH: I believe we lost Mr. Boniwell. 19 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Oh, yeah. 20 JUDGE ALDRICH: Can somebody from --2.1 MR. NEMIROFF: Hello. 22 JUDGE ALDRICH: Hi, Mr. Nemiroff. Yeah, we lost 23 connectivity with the Department's counsel. I think maybe 2.4 now would be a good time to take a five-minute recess to 25 see if we can reestablish that connection for that --

1 MR. NEMIROFF: I have to stay on the phone; 2 right? 3 JUDGE ALDRICH: You have to stay on the phone, but what you can do is you mute your phone. So use the 4 5 star-6 or the asterisk-6 feature. 6 And for everyone that's appearing by video, I'd 7 ask that you mute yourself, and you turn off our video 8 until -- for five minutes and see if we can get this 9 resolved. Okay? MR. NEMIROFF: Well, I'll just -- I'll just stay 10 11 on the phone the way I am. 12 JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. Well, all right. Five-minute recess and see if we can get Mr. Boniwell 13 14 back. 15 (There is a pause in the proceedings.) 16 JUDGE ALDRICH: Mr. Nemiroff, I'm going to return 17 it to you -- we're back on the record -- to continue with 18 your questioning. 19 MR. NEMIROFF: Yes. I'm actually very close to 20 concluding my questioning. BY MR. NEMTROFF: 2.1 22 Mr. Goldstein, you there? 23 Α Yes. 2.4 Okay. Were you informed at any time that the 25 principal in this case had settled with the government for

1	\$100,000?
2	A Yes. I was informed of that.
3	Q Who informed you of that?
4	A There was a gentleman that called me from I
5	guess he was an attorney and told me that he wanted to
6	told me he settled the case for Nick Moore for \$100,000
7	and would I be interested in having him represent me. And
8	I said, "Well, I have my own attorney but, you know, I
9	will talk to my attorney." And that's really where that
10	came from, which I didn't really understand that.
11	Q Okay.
12	A But that was the first time I heard it, anyway.
13	Q All right. And do you know, roughly, what time
14	you were informed of that?
15	A I know so maybe three or four years after the
16	hearing that we had. So if that hearing was in 2012, so
17	it was maybe, like, 2015 or '16, something like that.
18	Q All right. So it's by now, you know, five or
19	six years ago?
20	A Yes.
21	MR. NEMIROFF: All right. Okay. Well, I am done
22	with my questioning. Mr. Goldstein, would you like to add
23	things?
24	

WITNESS TESTIMONY

25

THE WITNESS: Yes, I would. I just want to, first of all, thank everybody on this panel for hearing this case. This has been, you know, very stressful and very hard on me because my character isn't about not being responsible or, you know, having accountability for something I've done wrong. If I felt like I did something wrong, I definitely would not have carried this on my shoulders for this long. I would have handled it in whatever way I could to -- but, you know, of course you heard it all before.

2.1

2.4

But I want to just explain a few things to you, so you have more of an understanding of the process of owning a gas station. Number one, you know, there's stuff in the exhibits that we'll go over, but I want to -- I sent you guys my exhibits. And, you know, one of the processes of owning a station is you have to be trained by Mobil. You have to work at the corporate station for three to four weeks before they can approve you to be a dealer.

You have to have anywhere from \$250,000 to \$500,000 of liquid cash. Even though there was a station that, you know, you could want to buy or not want to buy, nothing gets approved until you go through this process with Mobil. It's a very rigorous process. It's not that anybody can do it or any dealer can just hand over a gas

station to somebody else without Mobil's approval. It's a big process and it takes quite a bit of time, three or four months, to be able to be approved to be able to purchase a station.

2.4

That was one of the reasons in my mind I never looked at it as my responsibility because just putting my name on a corporation, I didn't realize at the time what the repercussions would be, obviously. It's not something that I knew anything about at the time or would know that I would end up in this position this many years later. I know it sounds naive and, you know, maybe stupid on my part. But I guess I was at the time because I trusted a friend. And I was kind of desperate for a little bit more income, and maybe those distorted looking at a bigger picture.

But I didn't realize that this could happen to me where I'm at today. One of the things that, you know, I want to address in my exhibits is the National Imaging Articles of Corporation for Mr. Nick Moore with the California State on July 3rd, 2000, which is Exhibit 1 on my exhibits. Exhibit 1 shows that Mr. Moore had this corporation even before purchasing the station. I mean, this was his corporation from past businesses that he did under this corporation. So I just want to bring that to you guys' attention that this corporation wasn't open at

the time of the station or the time where my name was put on the corporation. So that was, you know, Exhibit 1.

2.4

Also in Exhibit 2, you know, proof of the permits. I mean, you know, these permits that Mobil has to approve, plus the city, those permits were never changed into my name. If I had bought a business or owned a business, all those permits, all the responsibilities of a business would be on my shoulders. That never changed hands. That's why I never felt like there was anything going on that was wrong because it wasn't my business.

The business resumed, you know, the way it was from the beginning of me just doing my couple of hours, two or three hours of duties a day and moving on, not knowing the responsibilities of putting your name on a corporation what could happen; also not knowing that I was the only officer on the corporation. I didn't know that until the State Board brought it in and showed me the copies. And that was that they were filled in afterwards. In one of my exhibits we'll go over when we get to that, and I'll show you the difference there. So the proof of the permits on, you know, from the city, you know, there was nothing that was changed; none of the utilities, none of anything that was changed on that.

So we get into Exhibit 3, which is, you know, the process of becoming a dealer. And here it shows, you

know, what the process of that was and what you have to go through to be a dealer. And that's why I put that into evidence also. All these qualifications and signed contracts and everything that was on here was all done with Mr. Nick Moore. Any kind of transfer of business, there's documents that you would have to sign. You'd have to get approvals from Mobil. None of that had taken place.

2.4

I mean, there was no sale of a business there. I mean, that -- that was not in existence in what -- anything that I could ever see. And even, you know, the -- the rent that the State Board had said, you know, I was responsible for writing rent checks. Well, rent was paid from the gas loads that they added on to the invoices that was electronically taken out of the account. Which it states in this contract, the rent from starting date of \$480,000 a year, and it goes down to \$120,000 a year throughout the years of the duration of this contract.

So they found a piece of paper for a lot in the back that I -- that there was a separate account that was used for U-Haul that I signed for those checks. They were \$500 a month to rent the property in the back because he wanted to start a U-Haul business there, and it was an empty lot in the back. And that lease that was found by the State Board that is connecting me to this has nothing

to do with the station.

2.4

That was a separate entity that was in the back. I mean, you're not paying \$500 a month to rent the land of the station. That is impossible. But that's all a part of this lease in this exhibit, and I wanted to bring it to your attention because, you know --

MR. NEMIROFF: It's okay.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- the State Board claims it was, you know, me who made the lease to the station, and that's not the way it works. Also, that they had talked to the landlord, that the landlord, you know, stated that, you know, I was the go-to person on the lease. And that was to the back lease, not to the front, you know, the station lease. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention because that was what that was about. So that was a part of the Exhibit 3.

So it just shows you that he was the responsible party. There was no way that I could have been the responsible party in Mobil's eyes and any vendor's eyes and, you know, with utility bills or any of that. I mean, anybody who buys a business, wouldn't you think they would change all that so the person who sold them the business is no longer responsible. So that's not how this happened. So in my mind, I never felt there was a change in any way other than my name being on a corporation and

me signing the checks because this gentleman couldn't do it anymore.

2.4

If we go to Exhibit 18, the Determination of
Liability reference letter of September 12th of 2007,
which is Exhibit 19, that I had direct dealing with
Exxon-Mobil or made lease payments. Those are what I'm
talking about those lease payments. Those were to a
property in the back for U-Haul. That wasn't for the
Mobil station itself. And it was a separate kind of
entity. So, you know, these -- these -- there's a big
difference of a Mobil lease and what the true rent was to
\$500 a month in payments for this back lot. So I wanted
to clarify that because, you know, my name was attached to
that lease in the back.

But anyway so -- and the landlord also had mentioned that, you know, they had direct contact with me about the Mobil station. Well, it was a trust, number one. It wasn't a direct person that you're dealing with, one person. There were several people that were taking care of the trust. But I had never spoken to them about the land lease or Mobil because they didn't -- it wasn't our lease. It was a Mobil lease. We had a lease with Mobil. They had -- he had a lease with Mobil and, you know, the lease, you know, for the back lot was the only thing I've ever talked to a person about there.

You couldn't talk about any other lease. My name wasn't on the lease. I wasn't the responsible party. And they would never want to talk to me about something like that because they have to talk to Mobil, not to the person there. Because the dealer there, which is Nick Moore, was paying Mobil the rent, not the landlord. So that part of it I just want to -- you know, we have documentation that kind of shows all of that, and I'm sure you guys have looked at some of this stuff.

2.4

You know, we talked about my role, you know, of my daily role of working two or three hours. I have in Exhibit 4 my timesheets that I would turn in for the hours that I put in. They were handwritten timesheets. He would go off of that to pay me. Sometimes I go above and beyond if he needed extra help. After I closed the jeweler store, I would stop by for an hour or two to see if there were any issues that would arise if he was out of town. But if he was in town, he handled it all. I didn't have to stop by.

So in Exhibit 5, it also -- I'm showing you here that the actual letter that came from the bank about closing the account and kiting was the issue here. I didn't know what kiting was. And when I asked what kiting was, my -- the explanation I got is he had paid a check from his personal account to the business account, and

that check had bounced. So he bounced the check to himself, and the bank saw that. And I guess that's an illegal thing.

2.4

I really didn't know much about it back then.

After, I looked into it more and talked to the bank. And

I even asked him, like, "How could you do that?"

And he's like, "Well, I just forgot to make a deposit over here, and that's what happened."

And so it made it feel like it was just a mistake. It wasn't something deliberate that he was doing. And he got this letter. And he didn't come to me right away, but after a couple of days he called me into his office. He said, "You know, I have a real problem here to save the business. If I could put you on the corporation, I'll have Connie come over, sign a corporate paper. We'll send it over to the bank. You can go to the bank and open up a new account for us so I can resume my business to save this business. Because if I don't have a bank account, Mobil is gonna just take away my dealership license."

And so I was kind of put on the spot not knowing the repercussions of what could happen, not knowing that. Because I had no indication at the time anything was really truly wrong, he made it sound like he made a mistake with this putting a deposit without, you know,

bouncing a check to himself. And this is how this occurred. So I finally agreed.

2.4

Connie showed up. There was a blank piece of paper there. I signed it. She said, "I'll go back to the office and fill it up, and then I'll fax it over to the bank." I said okay. I went to the bank after a couple of hours, or I think it had to be filed. And then I had to go to the bank. They sent it to the bank. I never saw that piece of paper at all until the State Board showed it to me.

And the following, right before the year ended, she had showed up, and she say, "Remember that paper you signed for the corporation? I need you to sign another one for next year."

I said okay, and I signed it. And it was -- and she goes, "I'll fill it back up when I get back to the office." I said okay.

Those were things that I didn't feel at the time were dishonest things or were going to get me into trouble or anything else because the accountant was on board, and we were doing it to save the business. And it wasn't something like ownership was changing hands, or not changing hands, or things like that were happening. I mean, that wasn't -- not -- none of the roles really changed after that. Everything kept running the same way.

He kept -- you know, he was there every day until he got sick. He was on the computer every day, talking with the counter person, talking with me over the laptop, or calling me telling me I need you to do this. I need you to do that, you know, and taking orders from my boss. I mean, this is something that I didn't look -- think he was ever going to come back on me at.

2.4

So on Exhibit 6 is, you know, a letter from

Connie stating how the procedures and how things were

happening. So just to let you know the procedures. When

a gas load comes to the station, they drop the gas load.

They go to the front desk, and they leave an invoice for

that load. So that invoice, the front counter person puts

it in a file underneath the counter there. Once a week

Connie would come pick up that file, or Nick would take it

to her. When he was sick, I would take it to her.

So now, after I was put on the corporation, I started to have to make those checks for the difference. So Mobil got the majority of the taxes paid to them because of electronic money taken out of the account because they collected all the credit card stuff. And the cash difference is what I had to write a check for at the time. So she would come in and say here's the figures. This is the chunk I need, and I would write the check and hand it to her. She would send it in.

I didn't have the access to the figures or felt like I needed to look at figures. I also didn't feel it was my responsibility just because my name was on the corporation, not knowing that it is like, you know, why I'm here today, obviously. So it was a big mistake on my part, but I didn't know at the time it was. I was just doing what I thought was the right thing to do at the time.

2.4

So, you know, Connie wrote a letter stating -- I mean, I didn't -- never dealt with taxes with her. The only thing I would do is drop off paperwork of those invoices. The rest of the stuff she would come and, you know, look at the checks, the payouts, you know, bills, that kind of stuff. And all that kind of stuff was always taken to her office. Nothing kept there at the station. So I didn't have access to that stuff. All the invoices to the gas loads, all the stuff there, that was all piled in her office.

Also, in your investigation, the State Board investigation, it shows when they talked to Connie that she said, "He came and took the paperwork from me and hired the other lady, Ms. Fukazai [sic]," I think her name was, "that handled the audit stuff."

And he took all the paperwork from her and took it to, I believe, Diane Fukazai was her name. And so your

investigation also indicates that paperwork was taken from Connie's office to this lady to accommodate the audit from the State Board. And that he had taken all that paperwork and fired her and disappeared with that paperwork. And so, you know, I don't want to, you know, make it -- I'm trying to make a flow in the time periods, but sometimes I'm a little bit off. If it gets confusing, you guys can stop and ask me questions about it.

2.4

But on -- so Exhibit 8 is the actual letter from Connie that, you know, talked about the -- how, you know, things were handled with me and why I was put on the corporation. She also iterated in this letter because of Check Systems, and the time frame shows that was, you know, pretty correct on that. You know, things like the State saying that they settled or things that, you know, had transpired, you know, I was so fed up at one point I told Mr. Nemiroff, you know, I just want this out of my hair. It's too stressful. I don't -- you know, I can't live knowing I got, you know, this huge debt.

You know, is there a way I can just get this out of my hair? So he explained, well, maybe we can try to settle it and see where we can go with that, you know. We called the settlement committee. Mr. Warren handled it. We offered them, you know, I believe it was \$20,000. I was willing to lose \$20,000 more on top of everything I

lost, you know, just to get this out of my hair because it was so stressful. I didn't know what could happen.

2.4

You know, you hear nightmare stories of them taking your belongings and things like that. I don't know, you know, what, you know, could be. But having something weighing on you like this was a tremendous thing, and I wanted to finish it. I never got -- we never got a call back. We never got any kind of correspondence on it. I felt like I was treated so unfair by the State Board. I mean, this guy was the responsible party. They proved he committed fraud by taking the paperwork and not addressing the State Board at any time, other than with an attorney.

And all the State Board, you know, letters and their investigation always showed him as being the president and being the owner of the station until he hired an attorney. Then all of a sudden, my name came up. And the only thing I can think of is those things that weren't filed with the State, you know, they made sure they were put in there saying that, you know, he's the responsible party for these years to make his settlement either less or whatever it is.

So I was -- I think from my perspective it was like getting thrown under the bus when Mr. Moore assured me that he would -- this is not my business. It's -- I

shouldn't -- you know, he doesn't want to talk to me about it. It's not -- you know, when I got the letter from the State Board showing my name on the corporation was months afterwards. And, you know, I felt like, you know, they're not -- he's not cooperating with the State Board, so they're coming after me. And until he hired an attorney is when that started happening.

2.1

2.4

I didn't get one of the first letters like he did. It came months after. So I felt like nothing was being fair. And a big part of that, I was very intimidated because Mr. Moore's wife is one of the lead counsels for, at that time, Baxter Company. And she, through all of this, she got a big sign-on bonus and s big raise to be the lead counsel for Amgen. So I felt hopeless that, you know, she's a very powerful woman. They have a lot of money, and I didn't know where to go with this, you know.

I want to sue him for this and, you know, for this because of the things. And I -- I just couldn't. I didn't have the means to, the funds to, or the understanding of the responsibilities here, until I started spending some of my money. I hired a CPA that was a professional at this kind of stuff, who explained to me, who wrote a letter to the State Board. I talked to different attorneys, and then talked to Mr. Warren

Nemiroff and ended up hiring Mr. Warren to help me represent.

2.1

2.4

And I have to tell you. I mean, this has cost me a lot of money to this point, but Mr. Warren has been, you know, very fair in knowing that, you know, I'm a patsy here with this kind of situation. And he hasn't taken advantage of me at all financially with this. He's been a big help with, you know, me being able to afford his services with this. So I just wanted to put that in there for you guys to know. I mean, it's been a real nightmare for me.

So as we move on in Exhibit 10, Mr. Joseph Yang who was one of the HQ Chief Headquarters Operation. So, you know, in his investigation there, there were things. You know, a lot of this information that I got was from the State Board's, you know, investigations. And one of the things, you know, that had come up with that investigation was talking to Diane Fukushima about the audit, things that came up. You know, there was an unpaid balance, roughly, around \$60,000. I think the State Board's amount was around \$130,000 that was unpaid.

I know that the State Board had to do evaluations on what they thought the tax was because there was no other paperwork to go off of. So they did their investigations, and they didn't -- and I understand, you

know, how hard that could be for the State Board to do, but they did it. Did but the numbers, I felt, were very exaggerated. But it really isn't my business.

2.4

So I mean, that -- you know, they say you make 20 cents a gallon. I've never seen a gas station in that location make more than 7 to 8 cents a gallon on, you know, profit. It's a very tight margin. You've got a lot of competition in the area there. So I have not seen it. Maybe Mr. Moore raised prices, what I felt, afterwards to sell the last couple of loads. Maybe he was making 20 cents a gallon at the time. But when I was present there, I never saw that.

You know, in -- in the investigation also, it shows that Mr. Moore was buying the cigarettes from Costco with supplying the store. He was using his personal Costco card. He was -- all of this stuff implements him to the last day. Even the, you know -- let's see. In exhibit -- there was one part in the exhibit that show the final paperwork with Mobil. I mean, that was with Mr. Moore. I wasn't present there. I was gone at that time when, you know, they sent him a letter to, you know, shut the business down; that he couldn't be a part of Mobil and that kind of stuff.

So, I mean, those are, you know, there's a lot of facts here in all these exhibits that I had shown you.

And even in the exhibits that you guys have, you know, there's a lot of things in there that show he was the owner until the end. I mean, if -- just because my name was on the corporation didn't mean that was my responsibility, that the station was. You know, there's a big difference of buying the business and being responsible for it on how you handle it.

2.4

There's no way I would let somebody else handle the taxes or things I would be responsible for. Plus, I didn't know until he took the books and records from the auditor that he was even thinking of closing the station or even, you know, doing anything like that. That was, you know, a surprise to me afterwards.

So, you know, there was things. And after the fact of your investigation, I saw more fraudulent things that Mr. Nick Moore did. It wasn't just putting me on a corporation as the sucker there. But, you know, there was forged signatures. My signatures were forged in several documents. And I put those in exhibits, Exhibit 14. On some of those tax things that were signed, you could notice there's a big difference from that signature to my regular signature.

There were also payments that were made to the State Board from the accountant that I had no knowledge of because I wasn't privy to that stuff, you know, that she

paid from her personal account, you know. And we have copies of these exhibits here that I sent over to you.

JUDGE ALDRICH: Mr. Goldstein?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE ALDRICH: Mr. Goldstein, sorry to interrupt. I'm just giving you a 15-minute warning so that way you can be sure to highlight the areas that you want to cover before your time runs out.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you for that.

So one of the main things that, you know, I have a big problem with is, you know, how can the State Board settle with the person that they investigated that prove fraud by taking documents, not cooperating with the State Board, just hires an attorney, and all of a sudden settles it. And then puts me as a responsible party also, and not talk about what his settlement was. I mean — and how they came up with this figure to settle with him, and how they can make me responsible just because my name was on the corporation.

All the proof shows that the business day-to-day was still running by him in every aspect. So I'm very confused there. That's another part of where I felt very unfair and treated by the State Board. Number one, they wouldn't talk settlement with me, even though, you know, they did with him. Number two, you know, all the

investigations. The fraud was laid on him. I never had the paperwork to be able to commit fraud or any of these kinds of things.

2.1

2.4

Plus, that's not in my character. I mean, that's not what I would do in a situation. I'm a person that would handle things head on. I'm not -- I don't run from situations. This guy was an alcoholic. He ran from situations. He put signatures on documents that weren't my signatures that I didn't see until the State Board presented it to me. I've never seen these documents before like this.

I didn't know that the accountant paid for certain taxes out of her personal account. You know, these are things that were brought to my attention from the State Board under their investigation. So, you know, this is — it's very hard for me to believe that somebody that can own a business, pay somebody to manage or help with the business, \$500 a week, put their name on a corporation, stop paying taxes, and have them be the person responsible for that, and them coming out smelling like a rose. It's such a bad, you know — and maybe I was really dumb to be put in that position, but at that time I didn't know that.

I feel dumb now knowing all this, and I feel very stupid that I put myself in that position. But at that

time, I want you to realize that I had no knowledge of what was really going on because it wasn't done in front of me. I didn't know that he was shorting taxes. How -- how could I, you know? It was, you know -- it was -- it was very hard to believe that there was that much difference of unpaid taxes that he didn't pay.

2.1

2.4

But anyway, I just want to, you know, let you know that, you know, this problem has caused a lot of stress in my life. It cost me a lot of money in my life. I made a huge mistake. I admit my mistakes. I'm not trying to run from my mistakes. I just would like for you guys to understand that it's very hard to believe that such a mistake that I made of a couple of signatures on corporate papers or some signatures on some tax returns -- State Board returns, I should say, which I never seen IRS tax returns or anything filed, by the way.

But anyway this is, you know, a nightmare for somebody that was making \$500 a week to be responsible for hundreds of thousands of dollars. It really seems to be very unfair. But I respect what you guys do, and I know you guys have a hard decision in front of you. And I just am pleading to you guys to please understand the position. And I wouldn't fight so hard for this many years if I felt like I had done something wrong. I would never have taken it to here. I would have just dealt with it. I didn't

1 know I did something wrong, and I feel like I was 2 definitely taken advantage of. 3 And I think your investigation really shows that. A name on a corporation, I understand, has 4 5 responsibilities. But it's this type -- amount of 6 responsibilities is very unfair, you know, especially, the 7 way things were unfolding in this situation. 8 So I hope and pray to God that you release me 9 from this obligation. And I want to thank everybody for 10 I hope I was clear in what I was talking about, 11 and I hope you guys can feel the pain I've been through 12 with this whole situation. And thank you for listening. 13 JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you, Mr. Goldstein. 14 Mr. Nemiroff, does your conclude the opening 15 combined with witness testimony? I believe you're muted, 16 Mr. Nemiroff. The function to unmute is -- there you go. 17 I'm back. Can you hear me? MR. NEMIROFF: 18 JUDGE ALDRICH: Yeah, I can hear you. 19 MR. NEMIROFF: All right. So I don't think I 20 could say anything that could add to that. I'll save it 21 for my closing statement. 22 JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you. 23 Department, are you prepared to present your 2.4 combined opening and closing? 25 MR. BONIWELL: Yes. This is Joseph Boniwell. We are.

JUDGE ALDRICH: And after your opening and closing, I believe the panel will have questions for Mr. Goldstein.

And so please be prepared to take questions at that time, Mr. Goldstein.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

JUDGE ALDRICH: But Department, you can proceed when you're ready.

MR. BONIWELL: Thank you.

2.1

2.4

PRESENTATION

MR. BONIWELL: So the primary issue in this appeal as we've been discussing, concerns whether Appellant can be held liable as the responsible person for the unpaid tax, interest, fraud penalty, and a finality penalty of National Imaging Company doing business as Reseda Mobil Incorporated for the period of July 11th, 2005, through April 24th, 2007.

The Department is maintaining its position that Appellant is liable as a responsible person, pursuant to Revenue & Taxation Code Section 6829, for the unpaid liabilities of NIC for the liability period. Pursuant to Section 6829 and Regulation 1702.5, there are four elements that must be met in order to impose responsible

person liability on Appellant.

2.1

2.4

First, NIC's business activities must have terminated. Second, NIC must have collected sales tax reimbursement on its retail sales of tangible personal property. And third, Appellant must have been a responsible person for NIC sales and use tax compliance during the liability. And fourth, Appellant as the responsible person for NIC must have willfully failed to pay or cause to be paid the taxes due.

So as discussed at the prehearing conference and earlier in today's hearing, it is undisputed that NIC ceased business activities on April 24th, 2007. And it is also undisputed that NIC collected sales tax reimbursement on its retail sales of tangible personal property. As a result, the remaining issues with respect to Appellant's liability are: Whether Appellant is a responsible person under Section 6829 subdivision (b); and whether Appellant was willful in his nonpayment of NIC's liabilities, pursuant to Section 6829 subdivisions (a) and (d).

Under the sales and use tax law, a responsible person includes any officer, manager, employee, director, or any other person having control or supervision of, or who is charged with the responsibility for the filing of returns or payment of tax, or who has the duty to act for the corporation in complying with the various provisions

1 of the sales and use tax law. And here there is 2 substantial evidence demonstrating that Appellant was a 3 responsible person for NIC during the liability period. So first, the Appellant signed as president a 4 5 July 1st, 2005, statement of information that was filed 6 with the Secretary of State's Office and identified him as 7 CEO, secretary, CFO, and director of NIC. 8 I just want to make sure you can still hear me 9 because my video is being weird. 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. 11 MR. NEMIROFF: I can hare. 12 MR. BONIWELL: Yes. Okay. 13 JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you. 14 MR. BONIWELL: So you can hear me? 15 MR. NEMIROFF: I can hear you. 16 JUDGE ALDRICH: Yes. 17 MR. BONIWELL: Okay. Thank you. 18 And that Statement of Information is the 19 Department's Exhibit T. 20 Appellant signed a second Statement of 2.1 Information as president on May 11th, 2006, which 22 similarly identified him as CEO, secretary, CFO, and 23 director of NIC; and this is the Department's Exhibit T. 2.4 And under the California Corporations Code Section 321 25 subdivision (a), a president of a corporation is the

general manager and chief executive officer of the corporation, unless otherwise provided in the by-laws.

2.1

2.4

And as discussed in the case of Commercial Security Company versus Modesto Drug Company, a chief executive officer is presumed to have broad, implied, and actual authority to do all acts customarily connected with the business, including ensuring compliance with the sales and use tax law, even if that responsibility is delegated to others.

As such, here Appellant as president of NIC had broad, implied, and actual authority to do all acts associated with NIC's business, including ensuring compliance of the sales and use tax laws. Now, Appellant contends in his testimony today and his declaration, that he was presented with a blank statement of information that he signed. It was later filled out, and he was unaware that he would be listed as every officer.

However, as Appellant stated in previous submissions, you know, he agreed to become an officer of the corporation.

And as explained in his declaration with regard to the second statement of information, he signed it with the understanding that he would be continuing as president of NIC.

Further, even if he signed the form before it was completed, Appellant new that being added to the Statement

of Information would make him NIC's sole corporate officer. The form is clearly used to denote corporate officers, and Appellant was a sophisticated businessperson who was concurrently the president of James G. Jewelry Design, Incorporated, a retail business that had an active seller's permit from 1996 through 2012.

2.4

And based on Appellant's statements in the record and the documentation that we have, he knew he was the only person to be listed on the Statement of Information.

And as such, he'll be acting as the sole corporate officer of NIC. Now, Appellant's understanding that he was the president and a corporate officer of NIC is consistent with his signing the Statement of Information as president, as well as a fictitious name statement filing as president that was recorded in L.A. County on April 27th, 2006. And it's the Departments Exhibit U, and sales and use tax returns as president and owner of NIC.

Appellant signed the sales and use tax returns for the third quarter of 2005, the fourth quarter of 2005, the first quarter of 2006, the second quarter of 2006 as president, the third quarter of 2006 as owner, the fourth quarter of 2006 as owner, and the first quarter of 2007. These are in Department's Exhibit P. Appellant contends that the signatures on a few of these returns -- on two of the returns, third quarter '06 and the first quarter of

'07, are inconsistent with his signature.

2.4

Appellant hasn't provided any analysis from a handwriting expert to support his assertions. And this is the first time that Appellant is arguing that the signature on the third quarter of 2006 return is inauthentic. However, Appellant signed the related check for third quarter of 2006, which was made out to the Board of Equalization for \$2,315 and dated October 31st, 2006, which is the same date as the third quarter 2006 return.

And as just referenced, Appellant signed at least nine other checks made out to the Board of Equalization during the liability period. This is Departments

Exhibit Q. Appellant concedes that he had check signing authority. And based on the evidence submitted during the liability period, Appellant was the only person with check signing authority for NIC. And his role as president of NIC meant he was responsible for ensuring compliance of sales and use tax law.

And further, his testimony as to his role in how checks were prepared has changed throughout the appeals process, and it calls into question his credibility. But the evidence demonstrates that Appellant was directly involved in NIC's sales and use tax matters. And in addition to signing returns and signing checks to the Department, Appellant communicated with the Department

concerning NIC's outstanding sales and use tax liabilities several times throughout the liability period. These conversations are included in the Department's Exhibit R.

2.4

Now a couple, for example, on March 17th, 2006, the Appellant spoke with the Department regarding NIC's outstanding balance due. And The Appellant stated that his accountant had finished the return, and he'll be meeting with his accountant and will have his accountant call back. Now, this conversation demonstrates that Appellant was aware of NIC's sales and use tax compliance issues. He was involved in NIC's sales and use tax, and that he as president was directing the work of the accountant that prepared NIC's returns.

Also, on March 19th, 2007, Appellant called the Department, and he informed it that he was a corporate officer for NIC. He was made aware at that time of NIC's liabilities for an earlier period, and he explained that he was not yet involved in the business during that time. This demonstrates that during the time that Appellant was a corporate officer, namely, during the liability period, he viewed himself as someone responsible for sales and use tax matters to such an extent that he called the Department to ensure that it was up to date on who was responsible for the business.

And finally, Appellant also represented himself

as the landlord for Reseda Mobil and executed a lease contract on behalf of Reseda Mobil. Exhibit B is the copy of the lease agreement signed by Appellant leasing out a three-day work area at the business location for \$2,500 a month starting March 15th, 2007. The totality of the evidence demonstrates that from July 11th, 2005, through April 4th, 2007, Appellant was the responsible person for NTC.

2.1

2.4

Appellant's testimony and statement as to how he became president of NIC and a corporate officer have changed throughout the appeals process, calling into question the voracity of his testimony. However, what remains abundantly clear is that Appellant was a responsible person for NIC because he was the president of NIC with no apparent limitation on his authority. And he had broad, implied, and actual authority to do all acts connected with the operation of NIC, which included ensuring NIC's compliance with the sales and use tax laws.

Consistent with his authority as president,

Appellant signed returns and related checks. He

communicated with the Department on sales and use tax

matters and entered into contracts on behalf of NIC.

Appellant unequivocally was the responsible person for NIC

with a duty to act for the corporation in complying with

all provisions of the sales and use tax law.

The fourth eliminate of responsible person liability requires the determination that Appellant was willful in his nonpayment of NIC's liabilities. A responsible person's failure to pay the taxes due or cause the taxes due to be paid is willful if the three requirements are met.

2.1

2.4

First, on or after the date the taxes came due, the responsible person had actual knowledge that the taxes were due but not being paid. Second, the responsible person had authority to pay the taxes or cause them to be paid on the date the taxes came due, and when the responsible person had actual knowledge. And third, when the responsible person had actual knowledge, the responsible person had the ability to pay the taxes but chose not to do so.

Here, NIC's taxes at issue became due on the due date that its returns were due, on or before the last day of the month following each quarterly period. And those dates fall quarterly between October 31st, 2005, for the third quarter 2005, through April 30th, 2007, for the second quarter of 2007. On or after these dates, Appellant had actual knowledge that the taxes due but not being paid.

The Department's audit shows that for each quarter during the period of January 1st, 2005, through

April 24th, 2007, NIC reported taxable sales that were significantly less than the cost of gas it purchased for that quarter as reflected by NIC's gas purchase invoices from Exxon-Mobil. Over the entire period, NIC reported total taxable sales of just over \$5 million, which was over \$2 million less than the cost of fuel purchased by NIC for the same period.

2.4

As president of NIC, Appellant signed returns, throughout the liability period, certifying that each return, including any accompanying schedule of statements, had been examined by him, and to the best of his knowledge and belief, was a true, correct, and complete return.

Appellant's knowledge of NIC's fuel cost and sales are corroborated by his argument at the appeals conference, which was documented in Exhibit A and reiterated today, whereby, Appellant specifically argued that the Department improperly based its figures in the audit, and that the company profit margin for gasoline was only 7 to 8 cents.

Appellant was aware of the profit margins on the gasoline, and he had access to the fuel records. And he testified today that he would take the records to the accountant when Mr. Moore was not involved in the business. Given the foregoing, Appellant as president and day-to-day operator of NIC, knew NIC sold fuel at retail at a higher price than it paid. And based on his attested

review of the returns, he knew that NIC was underreporting its taxable measure for each period when it reports a taxable measure that was less than its cost of fuel.

2.4

With regard to Appellant's authority to pay the taxes due or cause them to be paid, the evidence already discussed establishes that NIC -- that Appellant was NIC's president and only corporate officer beginning

July 11th, 2005. Appellant conceded he opened Reseda

Mobil bank accounts in his name to operate NIC finances, and that he had the authority to sign NIC's checks as corroborated by the checks in evidence.

As such, Appellant as NIC's president, with no apparent limitation on his authority, had broad, implied, and actual authority to do all acts connected with NIC's business, including the authority to pay the taxes due or cause them to be paid to the Department, which he failed to do. Appellant had this authority throughout the entire liability period while he was a responsible person, and on or after the dates the taxes came due, when he had actual knowledge that the taxes were due.

Finally, the evidence establishes that Appellant had the ability to pay the taxes due but chose not to do so -- chose not to. Because, despite his knowledge of NIC's sales and use tax liabilities, he chose to pay NIC's creditors and not the Department. Per the hearing

transcript from 2012, Appellant stated that he signed checks to pay vendors. You know, specifically during the audit, records of NIC's fuel supplier indicated that from January 1st, 2005, through April 24th, 2007, NIC purchased over \$7 million worth of fuel, averaging \$788,000 per quarter.

2.1

2.4

And this is in addition to payments NIC made to Exxon-Mobil for the prepayment of sales tax on gasoline purchases for the period of third quarter 2005 through the first quarter of 2007 for \$292,257. Wages -- and also wages paid during this period totaling just about -- just over \$56,000. Appellant had knowledge that the taxes were due and not being paid and the authority and ability to pay the taxes when they came due. As such, as a responsible person for NIC, he was willful in his nonpayment of NIC's tax liability and should be held personally liable for NIC's outstanding liabilities pursuant to Revenue & Taxation Code Section 6829.

Now, I just want to take a step back and address Appellant disputing signatures on certain returns. In his declaration he disputed the signature on the third quarter '06 returns and the first quarter '07 return. As I mentioned, there was no return filed for the second quarter of 2007. However, the evidence discussed today establishes the Appellant as the responsible person for

NIC's tax compliance beginning July 2005.

2.4

Appellant knew the cost of fuel. Appellant signed returns stating that sales were significantly less than the purchase of fuel. Appellant issued checks to the Department to make payments on these amounts. Appellant knew additional taxes were owed but not paid to the liability period. Appellant has not raised any meritable [sic] contentions concerning the underlying audit liability of NIC, including the applicable penalties. There's no basis for adjustment to these amounts. And we'd like to note for the record that the prepayment penalty is not at issue in this appeal.

Now, I would also like to note with regard to Mr. Moore's settlement, which was spoken about at length. You know, generally, we note that the settlement of a corporate officer's liability would reduce the underlying corporate liability for the period for which the officer was being held liable. Now, as explained in Footnote 2 of the Department's Exhibit B, Mr. Moore entered into a settlement with the Department. And the payments he made pursuant to that settlement were applied towards NIC's unpaid tax liabilities for periods prior to the periods remaining at issue in Appellant's case. Meaning, they were applied to periods prior to July 11th, 2005, and had no impact on the liability tax from NIC to Appellant.

1 As such, for the foregoing reasons and in accordance with the Department's briefing, we request this 2 3 appeal be denied. Thank you. JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you, Department. Would the 4 5 Department like an opportunity to cross-examine the 6 witness? 7 MR. BONIWELL: This is Joseph Boniwell. Thank you. 8 9 JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you. 10 At this point, I'd like to turn over questioning 11 to my panel members. 12 Judge Wong, did you have any questions for either the parties or the witness? 13 14 JUDGE WONG: Yes. Thank you. 15 This is Judge Wong. I just had a question for 16 both parties, but maybe I'll direct it first to CDTFA. 17 NIC still in existence as a corporate entity, or has it 18 been dissolved or suspended? Do we know? 19 MR. BONIWELL: This is Joseph Boniwell. 20 have a current corporate status in front of me, but I'm 2.1 happy to find that out for you. 22 JUDGE WONG: Sure. 23 Mr. Goldstein, do you know what happened to NIC 2.4 as a corporate entity? 25 MR. GOLDSTEIN: No. Like I really stated from

the beginning of this, I had no knowledge. The corporation was his corporation before and it -- I had no knowledge that I was the only corporate officer, even though the State Board wants to claim that I did know that I was the only -- I was told I was being added onto the corporation, not taking over the corporation.

2.1

2.4

And whoever closed that, had to have been

Mr. Nick Moore that closed that corporation, because I

didn't. And I didn't have anything to do with that after

I left the business. So I have no knowledge of that

corporation to this point, but it would be interesting to

see who closed it out.

JUDGE WONG: Thank you. I had another question for CDTFA about Exhibit G. Could you speak to the significance or insignificance of Exhibit G or what it represents?

MR. BONIWELL: Yeah. Yes. Yes. So Exhibit G was discussed in the Department's Exhibit B. And Exhibit G really goes hand-in-hand with Exhibit H. So on July 1st, 2005, Appellant signed as president the Statement of Information that made him the CEO, secretary, CFO, and director of NIC. And then per Exhibit B, Footnote 19, on July 10th, 2005, Mr. Moore signed his resignation, position of secretary, as president and secretary of NIC, and that's Exhibit H.

And he sold his shares of stock in the corporation. And that's what is demonstrated by Exhibit G, is that his hundred-thousand dollars -- his 100,000 shares of stock that he owned in the corporation were listed as being sold on this Department of Corporations form.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE WONG: This is Judge Wong. Do we know to whom he sold those shares -- to whom Mr. Moore sold those shares?

MR. BONIWELL: It's not apparent to us to whom he sold the shares. But what is apparent is that as of that date on July 10th, 2005, these documents show that Mr. Moore, you know, resigned his position, gave up his ownership in the corporation. And that on July 1st, 2005, Appellant signed the document becoming president of the corporation.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: But do we know when those files -- that paperwork were filed?

JUDGE WONG: This is Judge Wong. Mr. Goldstein, did you purchase those shares?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: No, I've never seen any shares.

And when I read that those shares were sold for \$1, that's ridiculous. I mean, I've never seen stocks or shares or anything like that. That was never a discussion because I wasn't buying the business. That wasn't my business. I

was put on there for a reason, and that was because of Check Systems, and I agreed to help a friend. Everything that, you know, the State Board is claiming that I knew knowledge of before, how would I know if I don't have all the receipts?

2.4

And don't even know how to figure out what the difference would be to what was owed to the State Board. I signed checks according to what my boss wanted me to do. And I was following my boss' directions. I didn't feel like it was still my responsibility at all because I didn't know the rules of a corporation and know that I would be held responsible.

If I did know that, I wouldn't have agreed to do any of this. I didn't benefit by this. This has only hurt me throughout my life. This wasn't like I made money by putting my rear end on the line here. I mean, this — this was a nightmare that has unfolded in my life from a mistake of being put on a corporation. Which honest truth, I'm telling you that I didn't even know I was all these officers until the State Board sent copies. I saw their exhibits and copies from the State Board. I never seen those copies before that putting me as all. I didn't know he resigned from the corporation. I had no knowledge of this stuff.

JUDGE WONG: This is Judge Wong.

1 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I didn't dig into it because I 2 didn't know, feel I had to. 3 JUDGE WONG: This is Judge Wong. Mr. Goldstein, do you have any knowledge of who might have purchased 4 5 those shares, if you know? 6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I really don't. I mean, I wish I 7 did, but I don't. And I don't -- I really don't think any 8 person --9 JUDGE RIDENOUR: This is Judge Ridenour. I hate 10 to interrupt this response, but it looks like we lost the 11 CDTFA's rep again. If we could just take a moment to 12 maybe get Mr. Boniwell again before we commence with his response, please. 13 14 Judge Aldrich, do you want to --15 JUDGE ALDRICH: Mr. Boniwell, can you hear us? 16 MR. BONIWELL: Yes. 17 JUDGE RIDENOUR: Okay. Sounds good. 18 JUDGE ALDRICH: I believe that was Mr. Nemiroff. 19 Mr. Boniwell --20 MR. HUXSOLL: This is Mr. Huxsoll. This is Cary 2.1 Huxsoll. I believe Mr. Boniwell can still hear, yes. 22 JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. Then we'll proceed. 23 JUDGE RIDENOUR: Okay. Sounds good. 24 apologies. 25 JUDGE WONG: Oh, Mr. Goldstein, would you like to finish your response?

2.4

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah. I mean, as I stated before, I mean, I know it looks bad like I would have knowledge of this. But the way things were laid out, because the accountant handled the issues. She'd show up. Here's the amount of the check. You need to write a check for that amount. I didn't know it was short. Why would I put myself in a position if it was short?

The State Board had talked about me talking to the State Board about a settlement prior to this. Yes, I did. As Mr. Moore would say, can you call the State Board? Put me on a payment plan for this obligation that they say, you know, there's a difference there. And the accountant assured me that wouldn't happen again.

Mr. Moore assured me it wouldn't happen again. I did question that with them. They assured me it wouldn't happen again. It was a mistake in their accounting, and that payment plan.

And I took charge of it because I'm not running or hiding from any of this. I didn't feel like I was doing anything wrong by addressing the State Board. And I still don't feel like I've done anything wrong to warrant the dollar amount of what this obligation is. I mean, it's mind boggling. But at the same time, at that particular time, I had no reason to ask more questions or

1 think that there was anything going on that was wrong. 2 Because every month there was a check going out to the 3 State Board. Whether there was a difference, I wasn't aware of that difference. 4 5 I didn't know. And they certainly weren't going 6 to tell me that they shorted. Mr. Moore was still 7 handling all aspects of the business. Just because my 8 name was on the paperwork didn't mean that anything 9 changed to the day-to-day operations. 10 JUDGE WONG: Thank you, Mr. Goldstein. 11 few questions that I would like to get your thoughts on 12 some of the exhibits. 13 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure. 14 JUDGE WONG: The first exhibit I was wondering 15 about -- pull it up -- is Exhibit W. This is a letter 16 from, apparently, an employee of NIC. 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. JUDGE WONG: 18 Hold on. And she says --19 MR. GOLDSTEIN: It's a he. 20 JUDGE WONG: Oh, she. Sorry. He. My apologies. 21 MR. GOLDSTEIN: He. His name is Lalith. 22 JUDGE WONG: Okay. Thank you for that. 23 quote, "I was working at Reseda Mobil when Mr. Moore," and 2.4 yourself, "took over the gas station from the previous

owners in December 2001."

25

Could you address why this individual mentions that both Mr. Moore and yourself took over the gas station?

2.1

2.4

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, I didn't really start working there until after that. But I was, you know, I knew, you know, I was taking care of these employees, so I built up a relationship. I also want to explain to you that this letter was put together by Mr. Moore, and he just came and signed it and didn't know the reason of what he was signing this letter for.

And this gentleman worked the night shift, so the graveyard shift. I would see him every morning when I came in because his shift broke at that time. I think he saw that -- you know, we explain to him about the corporation and that there was new bank accounts and things like that. And, you know, he knew there was some sort of change there because of the situation with Check Systems. So he was privy to some of the stuff, but I was the one that corresponded with him.

They were four guys that were -- Sarah Lonkine, from Sri Lanka. And they were great human beings, and I worked, you know, very hard with them to, you know, improve everything in the station, do better to show Mr. Nick Moore we're all working together to do things, and bring in sales up, and making sure everything was, you

know, up to par. But from the beginning when he first took over that station, I wasn't there every day.

2.1

2.4

I started later on, but I would stop by and, you know, visit Mr. Moore, you know, kind of go into the back office with Mr. Moore. So they thought I was, you know, a part of the station from the beginning. But I didn't really start until, you know, I believe, you know, maybe six or seven months after that.

So and I wasn't coming in every day in the beginning. I started out just coming in a couple of days a week because he was there. And the only time I started coming in more every day is when he started -- he got deployed to Afghanistan for, like, three months. And so I started coming in every day. And then the time where the corporation -- I got put on the corporation, he got ill.

He was -- you know, him and I were, you know, having a little bit of differences. I was trying to help him. He had an alcohol problem. You know. I was trying to help him as a friend to, you know, get help and, you know, go to get sober. And so those things were in play at the same time as me being put on the corporation and things like this. So there was a -- you know, it's hard to explain, but when you're devoted to -- I'm the kind of guy that if I make a commitment, I want to do the best I can in the commitment.

I wasn't there to take advantage of anything or, you know, to -- it was basically to keep my store open and to try to save my personal business that, you know, I went to school for, learn diamonds. You know, I went to GIA and became a gemologist. Those are things that I was trying to save by using, you know, this income every month to save that store. There was no ill tension here.

2.1

2.4

I didn't know that it was being shorted no matter what the State Board will tell you on this. Because, you know, how could I know if checks were being paid out every single month, you know? How could I? How could I figure out those figures? Only an accountant could really do that. And knowing the price of gas prices, well, that's -- not only is it on the invoice, it's posted every single day on a, you know, a website that you can go to at Mobil.

That's -- the prices are posted on there, so you adjust your prices according to their prices. So you have to kind of look forward to the next price of load to adjust your prices so you don't lose money in case they raise prices by five cents on the next load. You kind of already have knowledge of that before it happens. So, you know, those are the things that I did. I didn't know the differences, what happened to the profit, or what was owed because there was also the chunk of sales tax is taken

electronically through credit cards, which --

JUDGE WONG: Mr. Goldstein?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE WONG: Thank you. I think you've answered my question. I have a couple of more.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure.

JUDGE WONG: I had a question about Exhibit, I believe it's R. This is CDTFA's ACMS System Log. It's a log of calls that they make to individuals. I forget what ACMS stands for, Automated Call Management System or something. In any case, in 2000 -- there's two entries that I wanted to ask you about. In 2003 and 2004 CDTFA called you, and in their notes of the call you refer to Mr. Moore as your partner. And I was just wondering what you meant by that.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, I meant like he told me to handle this situation. I called to handle it the best way I can. They asked me what my -- I didn't know what to say is my association for them to talk to me. You know, I wasn't a corporate officer. I wasn't on the, you know, anything to do. I had said that for them to be able to talk to me, not knowing there would be repercussions or that it was even a recorded conversation.

And I believe that was for outstanding -- a difference of an audit that came a year before. And that

was the time I put him on a payment plan. But I was told by him to handle the situation for him. So I acted as a partner, I guess, on the phone, but the truth is I was taking orders from my boss. I mean, that's really what it came down to.

2.4

JUDGE WONG: Thank you, Mr. Goldstein. And my last question has to do with another entry in the ACMS call log. Let's see. Oh, I'm sorry. That's incorrect. I think it's Exhibit W. It's 414 -- it's a 414Z. It's a form that an auditor writes down just the history of every contact with taxpayers. And there's an entry here from -- let's see. I'm sorry. It's -- the 414Z is -- let me try to pull that up.

Maybe CDTFA, do you know what 414Z exhibit -- oh, Exhibit N. My apologies. And it's from June 22nd, 2007. CDTFA called Exxon-Mobil territory manager. The territory manager told auditor that the last time he met with Mr. Moore and Mr. Goldstein was May 1st, 2007. He, referring to the territory manager -- Exxon territory manager -- believed that they were partners. And the contact person with Exxon-Mobil was Mr. Moore. Do you recall that meeting with the territory -- Exxon territory manager, Mr. Goldstein?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: So I wasn't there for this meeting. I -- I'm surprised that he thought it was me.

But I believe it was the -- either Lalith for one of the employees there that were there. Because at that time when they met it was for, I believe, closing the station. At that time I wasn't privy to that. I wasn't a part of that. I was already, you know, gone.

2.4

I don't remember any recollection of meeting this gentleman at the time and, especially, with Mr. Moore. So I don't remember that at all. The first time I knew about it was reading it in your exhibits. I had no knowledge of that beforehand.

JUDGE WONG: Thank you, Mr. Goldstein. That's all the questions I had for now.

JUDGE ALDRICH: This is Judge Aldrich.

Judge Ridenour, did you have any questions?

JUDGE RIDENOUR: Yes. Thank you very much.

Actually, I just have one quick question for

Mr. Goldstein.

With regards to the alleged forgery of the returns and payments, I was wondering if you filed a police report?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: No, I didn't. I didn't. Like I said, I didn't see those until years later, until the State Board presented it to me. So that's why I haven't done anything. The attorney didn't advise me to do that when those things came up, and I would have if I needed

to. I just I didn't know that those signatures were put on until way years after. And I don't think they would be any repercussion even if I did file a police report for him.

2.1

2.4

I mean, people with money and power of, you know, very powerful attorneys can get out of things. And then little people like us, we get -- get treated totally different, you know. Even talking settlement or even trying to -- you know, you just feel defeated with this. And even though I have to go with my heart and my gut and knowing I did everything that I could to be honest about all of this, and I'm still being honest about everything that I'm saying to you guys.

I never knew there was shorting of that on a regular base. I didn't know that I was going to be president or CEO or all the officers with him not being on the corporation. I wouldn't agree to do that. I was told I was being added to the corporation.

JUDGE RIDENOUR: Thank you, Mr. Goldstein.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Those were things that were significant. And even, you know, with you guys saying that, you know, we were partners. I mean, you know, that came up in a conversation. It could have been just for me to let the State Board give me, you know, direction and put Mr. Moore on a payment plan. But it wasn't in

documents or any legalities. I never paid money to be a 1 2 partner. I never, you know, did any of those things. 3 I've owned businesses before and after. 4 a procedure that you take and responsibility that you 5 And I get now, knowing what I know, how stupid I 6 was to have done what I did, you know. It's --7 JUDGE RIDENOUR: Mr. Goldstein, I don't want to 8 stop you. You've answered my question. 9 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Okay. 10 JUDGE RIDENOUR: I just --11 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry. 12 JUDGE RIDENOUR: No. No apologies. I was just 13 inquiring as to whether or not you filed a police report. 14 I diligently listened to your testimony and have taken So I do know it's all -- you know, I have listened 15 16 to everything, as my panel members have as well, so yes. 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. 18 JUDGE RIDENOUR: Of course. Definitely. Thank 19 you. No further questions. 20 JUDGE ALDRICH: Hi, this is Judge Aldrich. Yeah, 2.1 I had a question for Mr. Goldstein. So in your 22 Exhibit 19, I believe it's 102 in your exhibit packet, but 23 it's the letter from Heidi Galke. I'm not sure how to say 2.4 her name. But it's a September 12, 2007, letter. 25 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Are you talking about the letter

from the accountant, from Connie Fukushima? 1 2 JUDGE ALDRICH: No. It's from the -- I believe 3 she is a Successor Trustee. It's your Exhibit 19. 4 MR. GOLDSTEIN: My Exhibit 19? 5 JUDGE ALDRICH: Maybe I have the wrong exhibit. 6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Let me see 19. Letter regarding 7 the accountant in 2002 to vacate the lot behind the station. Yes. 8 9 JUDGE ALDRICH: Yeah. And so I was looking at 10 Item No. 2 in that letter. And it says, "National Imaging 11 Company -- James Goldstein -- as far as I remember was the 12 Mobil Station operator and such would have had direct dealings with Exxon-Mobil." 13 14 I was just wondering if you could speak to that 15 item. 16 Yes. Number one, she wouldn't MR. GOLDSTEIN: 17 ever have knowledge if I had direct contact with 18 Exxon-Mobil because Exxon-Mobil carried the lease with 19 her, not the station, not Nick Moore. So my connection 20 with her was for the back lot behind the station and had 2.1 nothing to do with the front part, you know, with 22 Exxon-Mobil. 23 So, you know, direct dealings with Exxon-Mobil, 2.4 this is a trust that several people talked to about in the 25 trust. That you recall, you know, you wouldn't talk to

the same person sometimes. So I don't know how they would have knowledge, but there was no reason for me, especially at that time, to have direct knowledge with Mobil because Mr. Moore was the only person that ever really did.

2.4

They wouldn't talk to anyone other than the owner of the business, you know. They're not going to talk to -- you know, they would treat me like a manager like they treat the employees there. They wouldn't treat me any different than that. And when the rep came to visit the station at any time, Mr. Moore had to be present there, not -- he's not going to talk to the managers or the employees of the station. He wanted to talk to the owner of the station. That's the way it is with Mobil.

So, yeah. I -- I don't believe that she would have any such knowledge of any kind of communication between myself and Mobil or even Nick Moore and Mobil.

So, yeah. I mean, I don't understand why that was even put in there, but it is what it is. And that's as honest as I can be with that. The only communication I had with her was that -- the lot in the back. It was just an empty lot that Mr. Nick Moore wanted for U-Haul, and so I set it up for him.

JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you, Mr. Goldstein.

At this point do my panel members have any further questions? You can give me a non-verbal shake of

1 the head yes or no. Yeah, I'm seeing Judge Wong has a 2 couple of questions. I'm going to turn it over to him. 3 JUDGE WONG: Yes. This is Judge Wong. Sorry. I just had two questions. One for 4 5 Mr. Goldstein and then one for CDTFA. 6 Mr. Goldstein your Exhibit 3 is a franchise 7 agreement from Mobil. MR. GOLDSTEIN: 8 Yes. 9 JUDGE WONG: Where did you get that? 10 So I had -- at the -- when I MR. GOLDSTEIN: 11 found out that the station was being closed, I went and I 12 had personal -- you know there was a filing cabinet with 13 my personal bills because I use that office, you know, 14 every morning. So I would write personal bills or things 15 like that. So I went to the filing cabinet to take my 16 personal stuff out of there, and he had already taken all 17 of the paperwork. You know, that was already after the 18 audit procedure was happening. 19 That franchise agreement was in a file there, and 20 I wanted to take it to see what, you know, what was done 2.1 in this. So I happen to take that and a copy of the 22

business license and things like that. So that's where I got that from originally.

JUDGE WONG: This is Judge Wong. Thank you. Thank you.

23

2.4

25

And last question for CDTFA. I just wanted to see if I could summarize your argument with respect to the knowledge sub element of willfulness. It's basically that's the NIC bought a lot of gasoline, and then they underreported that by a massive amount. And Mr. Goldstein is the sole corporate officer left standing, and so he must have known that there was underreporting. Is that an accurate summary?

MR. BONIWELL: I think I would like to specify a little bit.

JUDGE WONG: Absolutely.

2.4

MR. BONIWELL: So yeah, the massive underreporting. Over the period, NIC reported taxable sales of over \$5 million, which was over \$2 million less than the cost of fuel that was purchased over the same period. That's what you were saying. And as president of NIC and sometimes its owner, he would sign, you know, returns throughout the liability period. And each of those signatures, he was certifying on each return and any accompanying schedules and statement that the return had been examined by him and to the best of his knowledge believed was a true, correct, and complete return. So he knew the information on the return, and he knew that that information was underreporting.

And Appellant's knowledge of the fuel cost and

sales, you know, was corroborated by his argument today and earlier where he specifically argued that the Department was improperly basing its figures in audit, and that the company profit margin for gasoline was only seven to eight cents. He was aware of the profit margins on the gasoline, and he had access to the fuel records. He was just explaining how he could go into the office, go into the file and find business records.

2.1

2.4

And he testified today that, you know, he was the one that would go in and take control of the records and give them to the accountant when Mr. Moore was involved in the business. So kind of based on the totality of this evidence, you know, as president and day-to-day operator of NIC, he knew that NIC sold fuel at retail for a higher price than it paid. And based on his attested review of the returns, he knew that NIC was underreporting its taxable measure for each period, when it reported a taxable measure that was less than its cost of fuel.

JUDGE WONG: Thank you. No further question.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Can I ask a question? You know, you keep saying that I knew that --

JUDGE ALDRICH: Mr. Goldstein, if you have a question, you know, you can feel free to direct it at me.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.

JUDGE ALDRICH: But the Department is just making

argument, whereas, you're providing testimony. So --

MR. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry.

JUDGE ALDRICH: It's okay.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah. I just -- it's just frustrating because I'm telling you I didn't know the difference. It takes math. It takes an accountant to figure out what you owe, and I wasn't an accountant. And that's the reason why that paperwork went to an accountant every single time, and she came up with the numbers. How would I know it was being shorted until an audit happened? It's impossible to know unless I was doing the accounting, and that wasn't my role. I didn't do the accounting.

JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you, Mr. Goldstein.

At this point, I think we're going to turn it over to the rebuttal or closing statement for Appellant.

Mr. Nemiroff, are you prepared to provide that?

2.4

CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. NEMIROFF: Definitely. Anyone who knows anything about a gas station knows you have to have certain financial requirements to have any form of interest in that gas station. Now, during my career, which is more than 30 years, I have seen numerous times when secretaries or officers for a corporation get held liable for employment taxes and things like that by the

IRS, simply because they sign checks or have ostensible authority.

2.4

And invariably when I go through the audit process, the IRS goes back to the true owner. Now, my client made \$24,000 a year. He had no financial interest in this entity. He got put on here for reasons which he explained about as well as could be explained. Meaning, the man he was dealing with was a fraud. And I cannot believe, either in good conscious or common sense, that the State of California is going to impose a tax of \$360,000 or more on a man with no financial interest in this entity, who made an insignificant amount of money, simply because he signed a few pieces of paper.

That's insane. I don't know what went through the settlement negotiations with the true owner, nor did I know have -- who bought the stock, presuming it was a legitimate transfer. But one thing is certain. This man never had a financial interest in this entity. This man was a prop for a fraud. And yet, the State want to charge him with \$360,000 or more in monies for something that is totally beyond his financial realm.

What I think happened here is the State now has nobody to go against because they let the true party off the hook, and they've been chasing this man for more than 10 years. That's preposterous. It's a travesty. And

```
1
      frankly, the State in every regard should be ashamed of
 2
      himself and should rule in his favor today. Is that clear
 3
      enough? Anybody there?
               JUDGE ALDRICH: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Nemiroff.
 4
 5
               MR. NEMIROFF: Jesus Christ.
                                            Hello?
 6
               JUDGE ALDRICH: Hello. Mr. Nemiroff?
                                                      I believe
 7
      you've unintentionally muted yourself. Mr. Nemiroff, if
      you could press asterisk 6 to unmute.
8
 9
               MR. NEMIROFF: Hello.
10
               JUDGE ALDRICH: Hello.
                                       I can hear you again.
11
               MR. NEMIROFF: Okay.
12
               JUDGE ALDRICH: You cut off after --
13
               MR. NEMIROFF: Did you hear anything I just said?
14
               JUDGE ALDRICH: So you cut off after you said,
      "Is that clear enough."
15
16
               MR. NEMIROFF: In that case then, I guess I
      ended.
17
18
               JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. So is there anything else
19
      you would like to add before we conclude, Mr. Nemiroff?
20
               MR. NEMIROFF: No. I think that's about it.
21
               JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. So thank you, everyone,
22
      for your time and for being flexible with the hearing
23
      format. We're ready to conclude the hearing.
      is now closed.
2.4
25
               The judges will meet and decide the case based
```

1 off the evidence and the arguments presented today, and we 2 will send both parties our written decision no later than 3 100 days from today. 4 MR. NEMIROFF: Thank you. 5 JUDGE ALDRICH: There are more hearings today. 6 In fact, I believe Judge Wong and Judge Ridenour are on 7 the panel in the next hearing. Shortly we will take a 8 recess. 9 But before we do, I'd like to remind the 10 participants in the next hearing to exit this Webex 11 session and to use the previously provided link for the 12 next hearing when appropriate. 13 Thank you very much, everyone. MR. GOLDSTEIN: I just want to thank all the 14 15 judges. 16 JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you. 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you for hearing this case, 18 and I hope it works out. Thank you so much. 19 JUDGE RIDENOUR: You're very welcome, 20 Mr. Goldstein. Thank you from everybody as well. 2.1 you. 22 MR. NEMIROFF: Thank you. 23 (Proceedings adjourned at 11:36 a.m.) 2.4 25

1 HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter in and for 3 the State of California, do hereby certify: 4 5 That the foregoing transcript of proceedings was 6 taken before me at the time and place set forth, that the 7 testimony and proceedings were reported stenographically 8 by me and later transcribed by computer-aided 9 transcription under my direction and supervision, that the 10 foregoing is a true record of the testimony and 11 proceedings taken at that time. 12 I further certify that I am in no way interested 13 in the outcome of said action. 14 I have hereunto subscribed my name this 27th day 15 of October, 2021. 16 17 18 19 ERNALYN M. ALONZO 20 HEARING REPORTER 21 2.2 23 2.4

25