BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,)
DESIGN HOME CENTER, INC.,)) CASE NO. 20066251
,,)
APPELLANT.)
)

CERTIFIED COPY

VIRTUAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Thursday, December 16, 2021

Reported by:

SHELBY K. MAASKE

HEARING REPORTER

Job No. 34631 OTA(C)

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
4	
5	
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,
7	DESIGN HOME CENTER, INC,) CASE NO. 20066251
8)) APPELLANT.)
9)
10	
11	
12	
13	Virtual Transcript of Proceedings, taken in
14	the State of California, commencing at 1:15 p.m.
15	and ending at 2:07 a.m. on Thursday,
16	December 16, 2021, reported by Shelby K. Maaske,
17	Hearing Reporter in and for the State of California.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Panel Lead:	JUDGE LONG
4		
5	Panel Members:	JUDGE BROWN JUDGE ALDRICH
6 7	For the Appellant:	VICTOR CEBALLOS CARLOS CHATE
8	For the Respondent:	RANDY SUAZO CDFDT
9	Also Present:	JASON PARKER
10		CHRISTOPHER BROOKS
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX	
2		
3	EXHIBITS	
4		
5	(Appellants' Exhibits were received at page 6.)	
6	(Respondent's Exhibits were received at page 6.)	
7		
8	PRESENTATION	
9	PAGE	
10	By Randy Suazo 19	
11	by Kandy Suazo	
12	WITNESS TESTIMONY	
13	PAGE	
14	Carlos Chait 7	
15	Carlos Chait	
16		
17	CLOSING STATEMENT	
18	PAGE	
19		
By Carlos Chait 28	by Carros Charc	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	Remote Proceedings; Thursday, December 16, 2021
2	1:15 p.m.
3	
4	JUDGE LONG: We are now going on the record.
5	This is the hearing for the appeal of Design Home Center,
6	OTA Case 20066251. It is Thursday, December 16, 2021, at
7	approximately 1:15 p.m. This appeal was originally
8	intended to be heard in Cerritos, California.
9	I'm the lead administrative law judge,
10	Keith Long, and with me today is Judge Susan Brown and
11	Judge Josh Aldrich. We will be hearing the matter this
12	morning. I'm the lead administrative law judge, meaning,
13	I will be conducting the proceedings, but my co-panelists
14	and I are equal participants. We will all be reviewing
15	evidence, asking questions, and reaching a determination
16	in this case.
17	Will the parties, please, state their name and
18	who they represent for the record? Beginning with the
19	Appellant.
20	MR. CEBALLOS: Hi. My name is Victor Ceballos,
21	president.
22	MR. CHAIT: This is Carlos Chait, CPA
23	JUDGE LONG: Thank you. And CDTFA?
24	MR. SUAZO: Randy Suazo here, representative of
25	CDTFA.

1	MR. PARKER: Jason Parker, Chief of Headquarters
2	Operations Bureau with CDTFA.
3	MR. BROOKS: Christopher Brooks, staff counsel
4	for CDTFA.
5	JUDGE LONG: Thank you.
6	We have two issues in front of us today. First,
7	whether any adjustments for the measure of unreported
8	taxable sales are warranted; and, two, whether Appellant
9	was negligent.
LO	Appellant has submitted Exhibits 1 through 3
11	which were admitted with no objection. CDTFA has
L2	submitted Exhibits A through G which are admitted into
13	evidence with no objection.
L4	(Appellant's Exhibits 1 through 3 were received.)
15	(Respondent's Exhibits A through G were received.)
16	JUDGE LONG: We will begin with Appellant's
L7	opening presentation, as Mr. Chait intends to testify as a
18	witness. We will get his affirmation at this time.
L9	
20	CARLOS CHAIT,
21	called as a witness, and having been first duly sworn, was
22	examined and testified as follows:
23	
24	THE WITNESS: Yes, I swear.
25	JUDGE LONG: Thank you. You have up to five

minutes. You may begin whenever you're ready.

2.4

3 DIRECT TESTIMONY

MR. CHAIT: Okay. We sent some exhibits a month ago, I hope everybody got it, regarding the way that the audit was performed. There were two main questions. One, why the auditor did not accept our sales figures? As mentioned in Exhibit No. 1, Design Home Center had been working with a company who takes care of all of the sales. Because, as you know, a furniture store normally sells only big items. There are no small items. Everything is quite big. The furniture, the sofa -- everything is big.

It has to be handled by a system that allows for the company to sell and create the credit. The kind of clientele that Design Home Center has is the kind of clientele who pays by a different system. Nobody comes here with a bunch of cash. Everybody pays with a credit card or some kind of system besides a credit card or some assistance that the company offered to the potential client for the sale.

Everything is recorded here in this software, made by a company called GaliCorp, especially for furniture store that is here for -- how many years?

Around 10 years we have it here. And that is who we use to prepare the sales tax every quarter, and up to now, we

use that system. Because we have the figures, as shown in Exhibit No. 1, the difference between the sales for the three years are very equal to the amount reported. It's a very, very light difference.

2.4

We reported \$1,944,494.00 for this year, and the report that includes in Exhibit No. 1, and mentioned \$1,999,809.00. So we are talking about a \$40,000.00 or a \$50,000.00 difference only. Okay? The report was included to you as Exhibit No. 1. All the sales for three years.

Number two, the auditor -- that's the reason why
I'm not happy with the auditor, the way that he handled
the situation and was working with the purchases. There
is a lot of exhibits here and orders here, et cetera,
et cetera, but the main way that they use to calculate the
sales of Design Home Center is through the purchases. Its
called cost of goods sold.

In the report on page 81, he used something called total confinement taxable purchase. According to him, he went over to the vendor to get information. We do agree with some of the vendors, but he added other vendors that we didn't have relations with at that time. I don't know where he got the information. He estimated from what invoice. And he generalized it for three years, which is ridiculous. And some of the vendors, we were not dealing

with them at that time. And some, we were just only occasionally -- very occasionally. Because if we have this discrepancy with the figures, we need to figure out all over-calculations.

2.4

And, also, it didn't consider the invoices the generated for some of the vendors. He didn't consider refundable merchandise refunded to the vendor because it is not sellable or the order had been canceled.

20 percent of the merchandise is rolled over into the following quarter, something called inventory. And as a matter of fact, all of the inventory on the floor, that is the inventory running every quarter. At the end of 2016, we have inventory estimated at about \$80,000.00.

Finally, there is some defective merchandise that we cannot sell. We calculate around 5 to 7 percent is damaged by whatever reason -- the packing is bad. Many of the purchases came from different places, and there are a lot of defective stuff.

Finally, in the sales, the auditor make a big deal about the figures and 1099K. That's the form that is associated with the credit card business or sales. Okay? Of course there was a discrepancy between the 1099K and the actual sale because there was a lot of purchases in 2016 at the beginning of money received from the previous sale.

I have to explain. Before 2016, the company had a lot of sales. There was a lot of house sales. It was a good time where there were a lot of new houses and people wanted to buy furniture. And the company, at one time, the financing was good and the position was good, decide to create a house of financing brand. That was in 2008 and 2009.

2.4

That created a balance for the company, over half of a million dollars, that, actually, some was reported at the time during those years, but we didn't get the payment. They didn't get the payment. But some of the money, it came later on, little by little, when the client wanted to buy something else or decides to buy some of the old debt or something like that. That was only drop.

But that is the reason for a lot of the confusion with the 1099K. After a while, the company decided to deal with a company called Synchrony that concentrates on the sales. There is no longer house of financing program. So that's the reason the 1099K is not adjusted exactly with the amount of sale. That's, basically, it.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you.

Mr. Chait, I just want to confirm, before I give CDTFA the opportunity to ask questions, that you are done with your opening presentation?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm done. I am assuming you

1 have Exhibits 1 and 2 and 3 in front of you? 2 JUDGE LONG: Yes, I do have Exhibits 1 through 3 3 on my screen in front of me. Thank you. 4 So CDTFA, do you have any questions for the 5 witness? 6 MR. SUAZO: No questions. 7 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. And just as a reminder, please, state your name 8 9 prior to speaking so that Ms. Maaske can get an accurate 10 transcription. At this time I would like to turn this over to my co-panelists to see if they have any questions. 11 12 Judge Brown, do you have any questions? 13 JUDGE BROWN: Mr. Chait, I may have a few 14 questions for you. 15 THE WITNESS: Okay. 16 JUDGE BROWN: You had pointed to Exhibit 1, sales 17 Is there any -- is there any evidence 18 corroborating the accuracy of the sales report? In other 19 words, how do we, the judges, know that what's in the 20 report is accurate? Is there anything we can compare it 21 to that supports that information? 22 THE WITNESS: Let me give you Victor. 23 MR. CEBALLOS: The way we got the number was 2.4 through our GaliCorp system. So we have our totals for 25 the year, or quarterly, both. Our numbers match. I think there's a \$45,000.00 or \$50,000.00 difference, but it's very close. I think we submitted that report for the three years. The date is on the top right. You can see the numbers there.

2.4

THE WITNESS: As I said before, Design Home

Center is a furniture store. It's not like we are selling small stuff. If you came over here, you will see a big store with furniture, like, sofas and beds and all these things. There is nothing you can sell under the table.

Everything is sold through invoices, because multiple times, as I told you, 99 percent of the time, it's paid on credit. They want to have the guarantee or something like that, whatever they purchase. So it's nothing under the table. Everything is created in the computer, and an invoice is given.

And, also, as a matter of fact, much of stuff is delivered by the company. We have to have a record of going to the truck and delivering to the person, et cetera, et cetera. Everything is there. There is nothing that can be hiding here. That's the part where you don't understand. It's not like a store that sells small electronic stuff. No, it's not. This is a furniture store.

JUDGE BROWN: Thank you. Let me follow up my question with another question. Based on what

1 Mr. Ceballos said about \$45,000.00 to the \$50,000.00 2 difference, if I said -- if I said approximately 3 \$55,000.00, would that sound about right? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, \$55,000.00. Around 5 \$55,000.00. Let me ask, then, does Appellant 6 JUDGE BROWN: 7 agree that that difference exists? That there were those reported taxable sales of \$55,000.00, approximately, that 8 9 did not not get reported? 10 MR. CEBALLOS: Give me one second. Sorry. 11 JUDGE LONG: Mr. Ceballos and Mr. Chait, just as 12 a reminder -- especially in your case, because you are in 13 the same room, please, say your name when you are speaking 14 so that our stenographer can get an accurate 15 transcription. Thank you 16 MR. CEBALLOS: Okay. I was trying to get the 17 right numbers here. But if you look at the report from 18 Exhibit 1, we have the delivery costs. I don't know if 19 you see that on Exhibit 1 there? 20 JUDGE BROWN: Yes. 21 MR. CEBALLOS: There's a \$34,769.00. So there is 22 a little difference there. 23 THE WITNESS: Some of those items are nontaxable. 24 That is the problem. If you want a full detail, we have 25 to get back to the invoices. We have to see what's the

difference. At that time somebody else was doing the report and the quarterly report and there was some -- we have to analyze quarter by quarter why it didn't match, exactly, with the report.

2.4

In the three years, there's is a difference. We don't know exactly where it is. We have to go back. Was it delivery? Nontaxable item? It can be -- it could be many things.

JUDGE BROWN: Let me follow up and just say, is there any documents that we can look at that support what you are saying?

MR. CEBALLOS: As Carlos mentioned, we would have to get, for that difference, very deep in details to find that difference there.

THE WITNESS: The report is coming from the computer. Actually, we want to go to the invoice. I think we can do that today. We can get back to you. That's the reason we have a computer, to get information organized and timely.

Now, that's all I can say. If you want more information, we have to go to the document base with the invoice, but the invoice would be at the end, and it reflects in the report. Whatever we can do here.

MR. CEBALLOS: Another thing, we also have a thing called charge backs that sometimes we don't receive

1 them right away. We usually get them after from the 2 credit card companies or from the finance companies -- any 3 disputes that the consumer might have. Since we do sell 4 furniture, sometimes you don't know what's defective and 5 they just want to dispute because they were not satisfied after two or three months. So they dispute, and it gets 6 7 charged back. That can be, also, one of the reasons why there is a little difference there. 8 9 JUDGE BROWN: I don't have any further questions 10 right now. 11 I'm going to object to the MR. BROOKS: 12 testimony. I think if we are going to have information 13 coming from Mr. Ceballos, he needs to be sworn so that 14 there is some proof to what he said previously was 15 truthful and is truthful now. JUDGE LONG: Thank you for your objection; 16 17 however, I don't think any of us are considering 18 Mr. Ceballos's statements to be testimony, but, rather, 19 argument similar to any other appeals proceedings. So 20 that's how we are going to go forward with that. 21 MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Judge. 22 JUDGE LONG: I wanted to turn to Judge Aldrich. 23 Do you have any questions for Appellant? 2.4 JUDGE ALDRICH: So just back on that Exhibit 1

for Appellant's witness. It says the total amount of

25

1 taxable retail that's indicated there, it's circled, you 2 are saying that's for delivery charges? Is that correct? 3 What was your questions again? MR. CEBALLOS: 4 JUDGE ALDRICH: On the first page in Exhibit 1, 5 there's an item that's labeled "total nontaxable retail." It's circled. It's approximately \$35,000.00. What are 6 7 you attributing that to? I thought I heard that it was for delivery charges, but I just wanted to clarify. 8 MR. CEBALLOS: Yes, it was for delivery. 9 10 JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. So then there is a -- I see below that, "delivery charges house credit sales" and 11 12 "delivery charges cash sales." 13 MR. CEBALLOS: So the total taxable, is that what 14 you are asking me about? 15 JUDGE ALDRICH: I quess I'm asking what are these 16 nontaxable retail charges that are approximately 17 \$35,000.00? What are you arguing that that's attributable 18 to versus the total delivery charges which is 19 approximately \$45,000.00? 20 MR. CEBALLOS: So I guess what I was trying to 21 explain was referring to Judge Brown's questions, but we 22 don't have that exact detail. I was just giving you what 23 I think that the difference could be, why we were 2.4 \$55,000.00 or so towards deliveries and charge backs,

and -- you know. But like Carlos mentioned, for us to get

25

to exact numbers, we have to go through our invoices one by one to get that information for that amount. And there's returned merchandise and charge backs and stuff like that. But it's one of the reasons that there's a difference.

2.4

JUDGE ALDRICH: All right. Thank you.

I'm going to turn it back over to Judge Long.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you. I have a few questions. So first, with respect to Exhibit 1, during the audit, a complete set of books and records was not provided. Why are these invoices available now, and why weren't they provided previous to this hearing?

THE WITNESS: They were, all the time, available for the auditor. That's the reason my complaint about the auditor. He chose, the guy who -- if my English is poor, his is more poor than mine. We couldn't communicate. So he chose to call the vendor, to also work with the furniture we have on the floor and look at the price compared with the sales price, and trying to calculate a return of investment. He's using another way.

We never refused to give the information. We gave him the information, quarter by quarter. The report, but quarter by quarter. I don't know if he used it or not, but it was provided to him. Because he was here. You just press the button and the information is there.

He had the information we used to prepare the sales tax return every quarter up until now. Thank you.

JUDGE LONG: Additionally, with respect to the collections on previous and aged accounts receivable sales, my understanding, based on your testimony today, Mr. Chait, is that there were collections in 2013 and '14 for sales that were made in 2008 and 2009; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Unfortunately, the difference of the report of the sales with the generated report of the sales, every quarter, as we need the report, is more difficult to get from the past. Because we get a report -- this is a present report, showing all the accounts receivables are zero, coming from 2010 -- there is balance over 180 days, over six months, but we are talking about five years or four years. We don't know exactly, but we have almost half a million on balance.

JUDGE LONG: Okay. Thank you. And then to follow up on that. In your explanation that you included with Exhibit 1, you asserted that the credit card sales for 2013 and 2014 were artificially inflated because of these past debts, but in reviewing CDTFA's exhibits, the audit work papers, the credit card sales were consistent or greater in 2015 than they were in 2013 and 2014. And they are within, like, \$30,000.00 or \$40,000.00 per

quarter. Can you explain that discrepancy?

THE WITNESS: They are not credit card sale exactly. It's credit card collections including the sales. From the time of the credit card and also previous payment -- people keep paying. Unfortunately, not everybody pays. But we keep receiving payment. It's the payment received, not the sales. That's where it makes it confusing.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you. I don't have any more questions at this time. So we will move to CDTFA's presentation. You have 20 minutes. You may begin whenever you're ready.

MR. SUAZO: Thank you.

2.4

PRESENTATION

MR. SUAZO: The Appellant operates a retail furniture store located in San Fernando, California. The audit period is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2016. A prior audit of the business was conducted from July 1st, 2002 to June 30, 2013. Exhibit A, page 10 of 27.

The Appellant did not provide necessary records from the audit. Items not provided include complete federal income tax returns, balance sheets, general and subsidiary ledgers, accounts receivable detail, point of sales system detail reports, sales invoices, bank

statements for the entire audit period, and purchase invoices for the entire audit period. Instead, Appellant provided only the first pages of the federal income tax returns profit and loss statement for 2013, 2014, and 2015, a profit and loss summary page from 2015, purchase invoices from first quarter 2016, and second quarter 2016, and bank statements for first quarter 2016 and second quarter 2016.

Comparison of recorded sales which were reported on the next tax basis, to sales and tax returns, quarter sales disclosed differences of over \$785,000.00 from 2013 through 2015. Exhibit D, page 25 to 34. When the Department compared recorded cost of goods sold to the federal income tax returns to sales, calculated a 45 percent markup on the federal income tax sales. But, the comparison of cost of goods sold to reported sales on sales income tax returns, showed a markup of negative four percent. Exhibit D, page 24 of 34.

The negative markup indicates that not all sales were reported to the State. 1099K credit card sales information obtained by the Department's data analysis section of Franchise Tax Board was compared to reported sales for the period from third quarter 2013 to fourth quarter 2015. The comparison disclosed a next tax difference greater than \$460,000.00. Exhibit D, page 22

of 34.

2.4

Based on the above analysis, the Department considered the reported sales to be inaccurate and an alternative approach was used. The Department elected to use the sales amount recorded in the federal income tax returns. As percentage of error was computed for each period based on sales differences between federal income tax return sales and sales and new tax return sales. Exhibit D, page 21 of 34.

The percentages of error were applied to reported sales for the appropriate periods in unreported taxable sales of \$987,138.00 was established. For 2016, the overall percentage of 52.09 percent was used. Exhibit D, page 20 of 34.

During the re-audit requested by the CDTFA's

Appeals Bureau, vendors were contacted to verify federal income tax returns and recorded purchase amounts. Eight vendors responded and four did not. Purchases from the eight vendors were totaled for the audit period.

For the nonresponsive vendors, the Department used Appellant's purchase invoices of the four vendors for the first and second quarters of 2016 and computed average quarterly purchase amounts for each of the nonresponsive vendors. The average quarterly amounts were applied to each quarter to obtain purchases for the audit period.

Exhibit E, pages 10 through 21.

2.4

Comparison of the audit of purchases to the recorded federal income tax returns for 2014 and 2015 disclosed that quarter purchases were understated by \$227,728.00. The Appellant's purchases were impeached. It should be noted that the Appellant may have more than 12 vendors. A shelf test using June 2016 purchase invoices and selling prices provided by the Appellant disclosed a markup of 44.76 percent. Exhibit E, page 22 of 28.

Using the 44.76 percent markup factor and applying it the audited purchases of \$2,119,181.00 reveal a sales of over \$3 million. When compared to the reported sales of \$1.9 million, the difference is more than \$135,000.00 greater than the audit amount assessed of \$987,938.00. The audited sales of \$2,931,632.00 shows a markup of 38.34 percent when using the audited purchases. This is almost the same as the prior items marked up at 39.43 percent. Exhibit D, page 15 of 34.

Based on the markup results, the assessed liability was deemed reasonable as applied by the Department. Appellant contends the assessment of taxable sales is overstated as the federal income tax return includes interest revenue from in-house financing and customers who purchase merchandise from the store, layaway

returns, customer's canceled orders, not taxable rental income from commercial space leased during the audit period, and finally, accounts receivable from prior periods.

2.4

During the audit and re-audit, the Appellant has not shown that interest revenue income nor layaway returns nor non-taxable rental income of commercial space were included in the federal income tax returns recorded sales. Exhibit E, page 27 of 28.

In addition, the recorded federal income tax returns sales are based on credit card transactions, therefore, revenues of these kinds would not be included in the federal income tax returns sales amounts. Exhibit E, page 6 of 28.

The Appellant has not provided details of the accounts receivable from the audit period. The aging report provided with Appellant's Exhibit 3 is dated February 14, 2019. The summary report does not provide information required for adjustments to be made for accounts receivable. For adjustments to be made, the Appellant needs to provide customer number, customer name, sales invoice number, sales invoice date, sales amount, tax amount, the sales register, accounts receivable detail, amount paid to date, amount still due to date, et cetera.

Again, because the federal income tax returns sales are based on credit card transactions, Appellant's receivable amounts would not be included in the assessment. The Appellant also contends that the audited purchases are overstated because the Department used estimates regarding four of the Appellant's vendors. The Appellant, however, has not provided evidence that the estimates are incorrect.

The 10 percent negligence penalty is warranted as the Appellant did not maintain adequate books and records. The amount of unreported sales is significant. The percent of error is substantial. This is the Appellant's second audit. The Appellant was aware of how to report the proper amount.

In addition, when looking at the Appellant's exhibits, specifically Exhibit 1, there is \$1 million -- if I could get back to it. There's \$1,150.000.00 in cash sales for the audit period that he shows on his profit and loss statement. These are cash sales. These aren't payments. When you have a system set up and it's a payment, it's not going to record as a sale. It's going to go into the accounts receivable section as a balancing transaction. So it will show as a payment when the customer makes a payment and the receipt is given for the payment. So, normally, it wouldn't be construed as a

sale; otherwise, you would have difficulty finding out what is a true cash sale versus what is a payment on accounts receivable.

2.4

The taxpayer, basically, when they have a federal income tax returns, they're not including the sales tax. So what they're basically saying is that 9 percent of the sales are on a cash basis. However, looking at what's being showed on Exhibit 1, there's \$1,150,178.38 in sales which is, basically, 55 percent of the sales there.

In addition, when the Appellant is stating that they run a large store, however, the federal income tax returns show no wages. So that is something that is a little strange on where the cash sales are coming from or where the cash sales may be going.

The Appellant also states the inventory is around \$80,000.00 at the end of 2006. No detailed beginning and ending inventory reports have been provided. In addition, the inventory amounts have been stable for the period from 2013 to 2015 for the federal income tax returns. So why, all of a sudden, in 2016, does he have this massive buildup in inventory when it was stable the whole time? That is the end of my presentation. I'm available to answer any questions you may have.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you. I'll ask my co-panelists if they have any questions.

Yes, Mr. Ceballos?

MR. CEBALLOS: So on our system, our cash sales are the finance company -- as Carlos mentioned during his testimony -- Synchrony Financial, everything is under cash sales because they paid us directly for the purchase. So you guys should have our 1099K from Synchrony and from the other finance companies we use. So that's all on the cash sales. Just to clarify that.

THE WITNESS: As I said before, there is no cash sales. That shows, again, that the auditor had no idea with the audit. The way the cash sales that show in the profit and loss is the sale to the company called Synchrony. Do you think this company is going to sell \$200,000.00 in every year in cash? No. There is no -- that is not the situation.

They have no idea what they were doing. That's the reason, also, we went over to Mr. Chan, and Mr. Chan ordered in here to a re-audit. But the guy was so lazy. He didn't come in here and discuss it. Mr. Chan ordered, in September, a re-audit because he knows how defective --how poor the report was. And the auditor was saying all the paper he did not receive.

We provided the sales tax, the income tax, 1099K, all of that was provided to him. We provided, to him, everything. That is everything that he said was not

provided is a total lie, because we have the report. Why
would we hide the report? We have the report that they
did. Every year, it is here, available. The sales tax
are here in the computer. The purchases are here, all
paid by check, because they purchase big stuff with a big
company. They don't pay in cash. They pay in check.
Those are all the sales that are here. Now, regarding
JUDGE LONG: Excuse me. Mr. Chait, while I
appreciate you wanting to present your client's argument,
I ask that you please hold any further rebuttal until it
is your turn.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
JUDGE LONG: Because I want to make sure that my
co-panelists are able to ask CDTFA any questions before we
go further.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
JUDGE LONG: Judge Brown, do you have any
questions for CDTFA?
JUDGE BROWN: I do not.
JUDGE LONG: Thank you, Judge Brown.
Judge Aldrich, do you have any questions?
JUDGE ALDRICH: No questions. Thank you.
JUDGE LONG: Thank you, Judge Aldrich.
I, also, do not have any questions.
So we will allow Mr. Chait to begin his closing

argument. Again, you have asked for five minutes. You may begin when you are ready.

2.4

CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. CHAIT: I'm going to repeat myself, that it's the way that it was conducted. I don't know why Mr. Brooks, Mr. Parker, and Mr. Suazo are here.

Obviously, they are reading the report. I would like to meet with the guy who did the report. That's the guy who conducted the audit in a very, very lousy way.

Again, he doesn't know exactly what he was auditing. He was concentrating here in the purchases, including some assumption about the company that we didn't do any business during those years. We provided him some invoices for these company for 2016, I believe, and he generalized for three years which, economically, it's not right. And the other way to determining the cause of goods sold on the purchase, and all the other reports are here, our finance statement, our taxes, and 1099K, everything was provided to him. Okay. That's my rebuttal.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you, Mr. Chait.

MR. CEBALLOS: Just one last thing I wanted to mention, and to CDFTA, is that when you mentioned the 44 percent markup, that is not every sale. Sometimes we

do have to go as low as 10 percent just to get rid of stuff, because not everything sells. So that price margin fluctuates all the time depending on what we are selling. So it's never that margin all the time.

And then, also, to clarify, we are not a big company. We are a small business. That is what we are considered here. And I try to, as far as numbers go, to try and keep everything on track. I have to run most of our departments because we are family-owned and ran. Sometimes my numbers can be a little off, but that something that Carlos helps me out with. And that wasn't a guess is what I wanted to say. Thank you.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you.

2.4

Judge Brown, do you have any questions for Mr. Chait?

JUDGE BROWN: No, I do not.

JUDGE LONG: Judge Aldrich, do you have any questions?

JUDGE ALDRICH: I just have a brief question for Appellant's representative, or either can answer. But my understanding is that there was a previous audit. Were there any steps taken after the previous audit to change the administrative practice on recordkeeping or things like that?

THE WITNESS: As a matter of fact, I started

doing the accounting only in 2016. That's why they have improved the system from before. I think from that time until now, we have very, very exact and correct figures. We pay a lot of sales tax every quarter.

MR. CEBALLOS: As to our first audit, I did learn a lot from the first one. I believe that from that 2013 to 2016, I think I did a lot better job than I did those previous three years. So that first audit, I was just starting, but I do believe I was pretty good and pretty accurate on my numbers. It's just I didn't agree with the auditor when he came and just went by based on invoicing and margins and our price tags from before. That's the only thing I disagree with this audit. That's all I have.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you. I also had a question regarding Exhibit 1. So in your responses, Mr. Chate, you said that there were no cash sales, and that the records stated the cash sales were payments from Synchrony which all occurred from 2016 on; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: You are correct.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you, Mr. Chait. With respect to that, I'm looking at Exhibit 1, and it indicates that cash sales deposits were \$793,716.75, and this report only encapsulates six months of 2016, and that's approximately half of the taxable sales that are recorded here. Can you explain that difference? If the cash sales are only the

sales that were paid by Synchrony, but they're approximately half of the total sales, can you explain how that is that so many more sales occurred in that six-month period than in the previous three years?

THE WITNESS: Which form are you looking at?

JUDGE LONG: I'm looking at Exhibit 1, taxable

retail is approximately \$2 million. But the total cash

sales are about \$790,000.00, which is close to half. This

report is only for six months of 2016. And, otherwise,

you are saying nothing should be recorded as cash sales

for the previous years, 2013 and 2014 and 2015; correct?

THE WITNESS: Exhibit 1 is for three years.

JUDGE LONG: I understand that. But you just told us a handful of times that the cash sales are only the payments by Synchrony which occurred in 2016, and there are approximately half of your total taxable sales. And I'm just trying to figure out how --

THE WITNESS: I am sorry if I give information incorrect. Synchrony always have been doing business with Design Home Center. This is not something new.

MR. CEBALLOS: Sorry. I think what Carlos is trying to say is that it's not only Synchrony. We have other finance companies we carry who also 1099 us that year. We do have -- it's not only Synchrony is what I'm trying to clarify. Is that what you are wanting to know?

_	
1	JUDGE LONG: Yes. So that
2	MR. CEBALLOS: So anything that is not under
3	cash sales, it's our layaways, our Synchrony, our
4	Progressive, our ASIMA, everything is under the cash sales
5	report figures. So it's everything there. And that's
6	aside from the receivables.
7	JUDGE LONG: Okay. Thank you. I have no further
8	questions.
9	Does CDTFA have any closing remarks before we
10	close the record?
11	MR. SUAZO: No closing remarks.
12	JUDGE LONG: Okay. Thank you.
13	Mr. Chait, we have your testimony and the
14	evidence that you have provided today. Is there anything
15	else that you would like us to know before we go off of
16	the record?
17	THE WITNESS: No. Thank you for the opportunity.
18	JUDGE LONG: Thank you for your participation.
19	The case is now submitted and the record is closed. The
20	hearing is now adjourned. Thank you.
21	(The hearing was adjourned at 2:07 p.m.)
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, Shelby K. Maaske, 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 transcription under my direction and supervision, that the 9 10 foregoing is a true record of the testimony and 11 proceedings taken at that time. I further certify that I am in no way interested 12 13 in the outcome of said action. 14 I have hereunto subscribed my name this 2nd day 15 of January, 2022. 16 17 18 Shelby Maaske, Hearing Reporter 19 SHELBY K. MAASKE 20 HEARING REPORTER

21

22

23

24

25

33

Index: \$1..adjourned

\$	\$793,716.75 30:22	2013 18:6,21,24 19:18,20 20:4,11,	5
\$1 24:16	\$80,000.00 9:13 25:16	23 25:19 30:6 31:11	5 9:15
\$1,150,178.38 25:8	\$987,138.00 21:12	2014 18:21,24 20:4 22:3 31:11	52.09 21:13 55 25:9
\$1,150.000.00	\$987,938.00	2015 18:24 20:5,	33 25.9
24:17	22:16	12,24 22:3 25:19 31:11	6
\$1,944,494.00 8:5	1	2016 9:12,24 10:1 19:18 20:6,7,8	6 23:14
\$1,999,809.00	4	21:12,22 22:7	
8:7	1 6:10,14 7:8 8:2,6, 9 11:1,2,16 13:18,	25:20 28:15 30:1, 7,18,23 31:9,15	7
\$1.9 22:14 \$135,000.00	19 15:24 16:4 17:9 18:20 19:18	2019 23:18	7 9:15
22:15	24:16 25:8 30:15,	2021 5:1,6	
\$2 31:7	21 31:6,12	21 21:9 22:1	8
\$2,119,181.00	10 7:24 19:20 22:1 24:9 29:1	22 20:25 22:9	81 8:18
22:12	1099 31:23	24 20:18	
\$2,931,632.00 22:16	1099K 9:20,22	25 20:12	9
\$200,000.00	10:16,19 20:20 26:6,23 28:19	27 19:20 23:9	9 25:6
26:14	12 22:7	28 22:10 23:9,14	99 12:11
\$227,728.00 22:5	14 18:6 23:18	2:07 32:21	
\$3 22:13	15 22:19		A
\$30,000.00 18:25	16 5:1,6	3	accept 7:7
\$34,769.00 13:21	180 18:15	3 6:10,14 11:1,2	accounting 30:1
\$35,000.00 16:6,	1:15 5:2,7	23:17	accounts 18:4,14
\$40,000.00 8:7	1st 19:19	30 19:18,20	19:24 23:3,16,20, 23 24:22 25:3
18:25		34 20:12,18 21:1, 9,14 22:19	accuracy 11:18
\$45,000.00 12:1 13:1 16:19		38.34 22:17	accurate 11:9,20
\$460,000.00	2 11:1	39.43 22:19	13:14 30:10
20:25	20 9:9 19:11 21:14		actual 9:23
\$50,000.00 8:8	2002 19:20		added 8:21
12:1 13:1 \$55,000.00 13:3,	2006 25:16	44 28:25	addition 23:10 24:15 25:10,17
4,5,8 16:24	20066251 5:6	44.76 22:9,11	Additionally 18:3
\$785,000.00	2008 10:6 18:7	45 20:14	adequate 24:10
20:11	2009 10:7 18:7		adjourned 32:20,
\$790,000.00 31:8	2010 18:14		21

Index: adjusted..Ceballos

adjusted 10:19 approach 21:4 24:17 **button** 17:25 adjustments 6:7 approximately **backs** 14:25 **buy** 10:4,13 23:19.20 5:7 13:2,8 16:6, 16:24 17:3 16,19 30:23 31:2, C administrative **bad** 9:16 7,16 5:9,12 29:23 balance 10:8 arguing 16:17 calculate 8:15 **admitted** 6:11.12 18:15,17 19:23 9:15 17:19 argument 15:19 affirmation 6:18 balancing 24:22 27:9 28:1,4 calculated 20:14 aged 18:4 bank 19:25 20:7 artificially 18:21 California 5:8 aging 23:16 **base** 14:21 19:17 **ASIMA** 32:4 agree 8:21 13:7 **based** 12:25 18:5 call 17:17 asserted 18:20 30:10 21:2.7 22:20 called 6:21 7:22 assessed 22:15, 23:11 24:2 30:11 Aldrich 5:11 8:17,19 9:10 20 15:22,24 16:4,10, basically 10:20 10:17 14:25 26:12 assessment 25:4,6,9 15 17:6 27:21,22, canceled 9:8 23:1 22:22 24:4 23 29:17,19 basis 20:10 25:7 card 7:18 9:21 alternative 21:4 assistance 7:19 beds 12:8 15:2 18:20,23 amount 8:3 10:20 assuming 10:25 19:2,3,4 20:20 **begin** 6:16 7:1 15:25 17:2 21:5 23:11 24:2 assumption 19:11 27:25 28:2 22:15 23:22,23,24 28:13 **care** 7:9 beginning 5:18 24:11,14 attributable 9:24 25:16 Carlos 5:22 6:20 amounts 21:17, 16:17 14:12 16:25 26:3 23,24 23:13 24:3 big 7:11,12 9:19 29:11 31:21 25:18 12:7 27:5 29:5 attributing 16:7 carry 31:23 analysis 20:21 audit 7:6 17:9 **Board** 20:22 21:2 18:23 19:18,19,22 **case** 5:6,16 13:12 **books** 17:10 20:1,2 21:19,25 32:19 analyze 14:3 24:10 22:2,15 23:2,5,16 cash 7:17 16:12 appeal 5:5,7 24:13,18 26:11 **brand** 10:6 24:17,19 25:2,7, 28:10 29:21,22 **appeals** 15:19 Brooks 6:3 15:11, 13,14 26:2,4,7,9, 30:5,8,13 21:16 21 28:7 11,14 27:6 30:16, audited 22:12,16, 17,22,25 31:7,10, Appellant 5:19 **Brown** 5:10 17 24:4 14 32:3,4 6:8,10 13:6 15:23 11:12,13,16 12:24 19:16,21 20:2 auditing 28:12 13:6,20 14:9 15:9 **CDFTA** 28:24 22:6.8.22 23:5.15. 27:17,19,20 auditor 7:7 8:11. **CDTFA** 5:23,25 21 24:4,7,10,13 29:14,16 12 9:19 17:14,15 6:2,4,11 10:23 25:10,15 26:10,21 30:11 **Brown's** 16:21 11:4 27:14,18 appellant's 6:14, 32:9 average 21:22,24 buildup 25:21 16 15:25 21:21 **CDTFA's** 18:22 22:5 23:17 24:2,6, aware 24:13 **bunch** 7:17 19:10 21:15 12,15 29:20 Bureau 6:2 21:16 Ceballos 5:20 applied 21:10,24 В business 9:21 11:23 13:1,10,11, 22:21 19:19 28:14 29:6 16,21 14:12,24 back 13:25 14:6, applying 22:12 31:19 15:13 16:3,9,13, 17 15:7,24 17:7 20 26:1,2 28:23

Index: Ceballos's..disagree

30:5 31:21 32:2 commercial 23:2, contends 22:22 **deep** 14:13 24:4 Ceballos's 15:18 defective 9:14,18 communicate 15:4 26:20 correct 16:2 18:8 Center 5:5 7:8.15 17:16 30:3,18,19 31:11 8:16 12:6 31:20 delivered 12:17 companies 15:2 corroborating Cerritos 5:8 deliveries 16:24 26:7 31:23 11:18 delivering 12:18 cetera 8:14,15 cost 8:17 20:13,16 company 7:9,14, 12:19 23:25 19,22 10:1,4,8,16, delivery 13:18 costs 13:18 17 12:17 26:3,12, **Chait** 5:22 6:17,20 14:7 16:2,8,9,11, 7:4 10:22 11:13 13 27:6 28:13,15 counsel 6:3 12,18 13:11 18:6 27:8, 29:6 **CPA** 5:22 Department 25 28:5,22 29:15 compare 11:20 20:13 21:2,4,20 30:20 32:13 create 7:14 10:6 22:22 24:5 compared 17:19 Chan 26:17,19 created 10:8 20:13,22 22:13 **Department's** 12:14 **change** 29:22 20:21 comparison **credit** 7:14,17,18 20:9,16,24 22:2 departments **charge** 14:25 9:21 12:12 15:2 16:24 17:3 29:9 complaint 17:14 16:11 18:20,23 charged 15:7 19:2,3,4 20:20 depending 29:3 complete 17:10 23:11 24:2 19:22 deposits 30:22 **charges** 16:2,8, 11,12,16,18 customer 23:21 computed 21:6, **Design** 5:5 7:8,15 24:24 Chate 30:15 22 8:16 12:5 31:20 customer's 23:1 check 27:5,6 computer 12:15 detail 13:24 16:22 14:16,18 27:4 customers 22:25 19:24,25 23:24 Chief 6:1 concentrates detailed 25:16 chose 17:15.17 10:17 D **details** 14:13 Christopher 6:3 concentrating 23:15 damaged 9:16 **circled** 16:1,6 28:12 determination data 20:21 conducted 19:19 **clarify** 16:8 26:8 5:15 29:5 31:25 28:6,10 date 12:3 23:22.24 determining conducting 5:13 client 7:20 10:12 28:17 dated 23:17 confinement **client's** 27:9 difference 8:2,4,8 days 18:15 8:19 12:1 13:2,7,22 clientele 7:15.16 deal 9:20 10:17 14:1,5,13,14 15:8 **confirm** 10:22 16:23 17:5 18:9 close 12:2 31:8 dealing 8:25 confusing 19:8 20:25 22:14 30:25 32:10 debt 10:14 confusion 10:15 differences **closed** 32:19 debts 18:22 20:11 21:7 considered 21:3 closing 27:25 December 5:1.6 difficult 18:12 29:7 28:4 32:9,11 decide 10:5 consistent 18:23 difficulty 25:1 co-panelists 5:13 11:11 25:24 decided 10:16 construed 24:25 DIRECT 7:3 27:14 decides 10:13 consumer 15:3 directly 26:5 collections 18:4, **deemed** 22:21 contacted 21:16 disagree 30:13 6 19:3

disclosed 20:11, exact 16:22 17:1 Financial 26:4 guy 17:15 26:18 24 22:4,9 30:3 28:9 financing 10:5,6, discrepancy 9:3, examined 6:22 18 22:24 guys 26:6 22 19:1 Excuse 27:8 find 14:13 **discuss** 26:19 Н Exhibit 7:8 8:2,6, finding 25:1 **dispute** 15:5,6 9 11:16 13:18,19 floor 9:11 17:18 **half** 10:8 18:17 15:24 16:4 17:9 disputes 15:3 30:24 31:2,8,16 18:20 19:20 fluctuates 29:3 document 14:21 20:12,18,25 21:9, handful 31:14 follow 12:24 14:9 13 22:1,9,19 23:9, documents 18:19 handled 7:13 13.17 24:16 25:8 14:10 8:12 30:15,21 31:6,12 form 9:20 31:5 dollars 10:9 **happy** 8:12 **exhibits** 6:10,12, forward 15:20 14.15 7:4 8:14 **drop** 10:14 **Headquarters** fourth 20:23 11:1,2 18:22 6:1 due 23:24 24:16 Franchise 20:22 heard 5:8 16:7 duly 6:21 exists 13:7 front 6:6 11:1,3 **hearing** 5:5,11 explain 10:1 full 13:24 17:12 32:20,21 Ε 16:21 19:1 30:25 **furniture** 7:10,12, helps 29:11 31:2 23 10:4 12:6,8,23 economically hide 27:2 explanation 15:4 17:18 19:17 28:16 18:19 **hiding** 12:20 elected 21:4 G hold 27:10 electronic 12:22 F **Home** 5:5 7:8,15 encapsulates Galicorp 7:22 8:16 12:5 31:20 fact 9:11 12:16 30:23 11:24 29:25 **hope** 7:5 **end** 9:12 14:22 gave 17:22 **factor** 22:11 house 10:2,6,18 25:16,22 general 19:23 16:11 family-owned **ending** 25:17 generalized 8:24 29:9 **houses** 10:3 English 17:15 28:16 February 23:18 **entire** 20:1,2 generated 9:6 ı federal 19:23 18:10 equal 5:14 8:3 20:3,14,15 21:5,7, give 10:22 11:22 idea 26:10,16 16 22:3,23 23:8, error 21:6,10 13:10 17:21 31:18 10,13 24:1 25:4, 24:12 impeached 22:5 11,19 **giving** 16:22 established improved 30:2 Fernando 19:17 21:12 **good** 10:3,5 30:9 in-house 22:24 figure 9:3 31:17 estimated 8:23 **goods** 8:17 20:13, inaccurate 21:3 9:13 16 28:18 figures 7:7 8:1 **include** 19:22 9:3,20 30:3 32:5 estimates 24:6,8 greater 18:24 20:25 22:15 included 8:9 **finally** 9:14,19 evidence 5:15 18:19 23:8,12 23:3 6:13 11:17 24:7 guarantee 12:12 24:3 32:14 finance 15:2 26:3, guess 16:15,20 includes 8:6 7 28:19 31:23 29:12

22:24 iudge 5:4,9,10,11, **Long** 5:4,10,23 mentioned 7:8 12,23 6:5,16,25 6:5,16,25 10:21 8:6 14:12 16:25 including 19:3 26:3 28:24 10:21 11:2,7,12, 11:2,7 13:11 25:5 28:13 13,16 12:24 13:6, 15:16,22 17:7,8 merchandise **income** 19:23 11,20 14:9 15:9, 18:3,18 19:9 9:7,9,14 17:3 20:3,14,15,17 16,21,22,24 16:4, 25:24 27:8,13,17, 22:25 21:5,7,17 22:3,23 10,15,21 17:6,7,8 20,23 28:22 23:2,6,7,8,10,13 18:3,18 19:9 29:13,17 30:14,20 million 10:9 18:17 31:6,13 32:1,7,12, 22:13,14 24:16 24:1 25:5,11,19 25:24 27:8,13,17, 19,20,21,22,23 18 26:23 31:7 28:22 29:13,14, incorrect 24:8 **longer** 10:18 mine 17:16 16,17,19 30:14,20 31:19 31:6,13 32:1,7,12, **loss** 20:4,5 24:19 minutes 7:1 18 inflated 18:21 26:12 19:11 28:1 information 8:20, **judges** 11:19 lot 8:14 9:18.23 money 9:24 10:12 10:2,3,15 30:4,6,7 23 11:21 14:18,21 **July** 19:18,19 month 7:4 15:12 17:2,21,22, lousy 28:10 June 19:18,20 months 15:6 25 18:1 20:21 23:19 31:18 22:7 low 29:1 18:15 30:23 31:9 intended 5:8 morning 5:12 Κ M intends 6:17 move 19:10 interest 22:24 multiple 12:11 **Keith** 5:10 Maaske 11:9 23:6 kind 7:14,15,18 made 7:22 18:7 inventory 9:10, Ν 23:19,20 kinds 23:12 11,12,13 25:15, **main** 7:6 8:15 17,18,21 **negative** 20:17,19 L maintain 24:10 investment 17:20 negligence 24:9 make 9:19 27:13 invoice 8:24 negligent 6:9 labeled 16:5 12:15 14:16,22 makes 19:7 24:24 non-taxable 23:7 large 25:11 23:22 margin 29:2,4 nonresponsive invoices 9:5 **law** 5:9,12 **margins** 30:12 21:20,23 12:10 13:25 17:1, layaway 22:25 11 19:25 20:2,6 **marked** 22:18 nontaxable 13:23 23:6 21:21 22:8 28:15 14:7 16:5,16 markup 20:15,17, layaways 32:3 invoicing 30:11 19 22:9,11,17,20 noted 22:6 lazy 26:18 28:25 issues 6:6 number 8:11 **lead** 5:9,12 massive 25:20 11:23 23:21,22 item 14:7 16:5 learn 30:5 match 11:25 14:3 **numbers** 11:25 items 7:11 13:23 12:4 13:17 17:1 19:22 22:18 leased 23:2 matter 5:11 9:11 29:7,10 30:10 12:16 29:25 ledgers 19:24 liability 22:21 meaning 5:12 0 measure 6:7 lie 27:1 Jason 6:1 **object** 15:11 meet 28:9 light 8:4 **iob** 30:7 objection 6:11,13 mention 28:24 located 19:17 Josh 5:11 15:16

Index: obtain..receivable

obtain 21:25 past 18:12,22 15 25:22 Q obtained 20:21 president 5:21 **pay** 27:6 30:4 occasionally 9:2 paying 19:5 press 17:25 quarter 7:25 9:10, 12 14:3 17:22,23 occurred 30:18 payment 10:11 pretty 30:9 18:2,11 19:1 20:6, 31:3,15 19:5,6,7 24:21,23, previous 9:24 7,8,10,23,24 24,25 25:2 offered 7:19 17:12 18:4 19:4 21:25 22:4 30:4 payments 24:20 29:21,22 30:8 opening 6:17 quarterly 11:25 30:17 31:15 31:4,11 10:24 14:2 21:23,24 pays 7:16,17 19:6 previously 15:14 operates 19:16 quarters 21:22 penalty 24:9 **price** 17:18,19 Operations 6:2 question 12:25 29:2 30:12 **people** 10:3 19:5 29:19 30:14 opportunity prices 22:8 10:23 32:17 percent 9:9,15 questions 5:15 12:11 20:15,18 prior 11:9 19:19 7:6 10:23 11:4,6, order 9:8 22:18 23:3 21:13 22:9,11,17, 11.12.14 15:9.23 ordered 26:18,19 19 24:9,12 25:6,9 16:3,21 17:8 problem 13:24 28:25 29:1 19:10 25:23,25 orders 8:14 23:1 proceedings 5:1, 27:14,18,21,22,24 percentage 21:6, organized 14:19 13 15:19 29:14,18 32:8 13 originally 5:7 **profit** 20:4,5 24:18 percentages 26:12 R **OTA** 5:6 21:10 program 10:18 performed 7:6 overran 29:9 Progressive 32:4 calculations 9:4 period 19:18 20:1, Randy 5:24 2,23 21:7,19,25 **proof** 15:14 overstated 22:23 re-audit 21:15 23:3,16 24:18 24:5 **proper** 24:14 23:5 26:18,20 25:18 31:4 provide 19:21 reaching 5:15 Ρ periods 21:11 23:18,21 23:4 reading 28:8 provided 17:10, **p.m.** 5:2,7 32:21 **person** 12:18 ready 7:1 19:12 12,24 19:22 20:3 packing 9:16 28:2 places 9:17 22:8 23:15,17 24:7 25:17 26:23, reason 8:11 9:16 pages 20:3 22:1 **point** 19:24 24 27:1 28:14,20 10:15,19 14:18 paid 12:12 23:24 pointed 11:16 32:14 17:14 26:17 26:5 27:5 31:1 poor 17:15,16 purchase 8:19 reasonable 22:21 paper 26:22 26:21 12:13 20:1,5 reasons 15:7 21:17,21,23 22:7, **papers** 18:23 position 10:5 25 26:5 27:5 17:4 Parker 6:1 28:7 potential 7:19 28:18 rebuttal 27:10 28:21 part 12:20 practice 29:23 purchases 8:13, 16 9:17,23 21:18, receipt 24:24 participants 5:14 prepare 7:25 18:1 25 22:2,4,5,12,17 receivable 18:4 participation 24:5 27:4 28:12 **present** 18:13 32:18 19:24 23:3,16,20, 27:9 23 24:3,22 25:3 parties 5:17 presentation 6:17 10:24 19:11,

receivables 22:13 **showing** 18:13 18:14 32:6 S shown 8:1 23:6 reports 19:25 receive 14:25 25:17 28:18 **shows** 22:16 sale 7:20 9:23,25 26:22 represent 5:18 24:18 26:10 10:20 19:2 24:21 received 6:14,15 25:1,2 26:12 representative significant 24:11 9:24 19:7 28:25 5:24 29:20 similar 15:19 receiving 19:6 **sales** 6:8 7:7,9,25 requested 21:15 situation 8:13 8:2,9,16 9:19,21 record 5:4,18 required 23:19 26:15 10:2,18 11:16,18 12:17 24:21 13:8 16:11,12 32:10,16,19 respect 17:9 18:3 six-month 31:3 17:19 18:1,5,7,10, 30:20 recorded 7:21 **small** 7:11 12:7,22 11,20,23 19:4,7, 20:9,13 21:5,17 responded 21:18 29:6 25 20:9,10,11,14, 22:3 23:8,10 15,16,17,19,20,23 respondent's **sofa** 7:12 30:24 31:10 21:3,5,7,8,11,12 6:15 **sofas** 12:8 22:13,14,16,23 recordkeeping responses 30:15 23:8,11,13,22,23 29:23 software 7:21 24:2,11,18,19 results 22:20 **records** 17:10 25:5,7,8,9,13,14 **sold** 8:17 12:10 19:21 24:10 30:16 retail 16:1,5,16 26:2,5,8,10,11,23 20:13,16 28:18 19:16 31:7 27:3,7 30:4,16,17, referring 16:21 **sound** 13:3 22,24,25 31:1,2,3, return 17:20 18:2 reflects 14:23 8,10,14,16 32:3,4 space 23:2,7 21:8 22:23 refundable 9:7 **San** 19:17 speaking 11:9 returned 17:3 13:13 refunded 9:7 satisfied 15:5 returns 19:23 specifically refused 17:21 screen 11:3 20:4,10,14,17 24:16 21:6,17 22:3 23:1, register 23:23 section 20:22 stable 25:18.21 6,8,11,13 24:1 24:22 relations 8:22 25:5,12,19 staff 6:3 sell 7:14 9:15 12:9 remarks 32:9.11 **reveal** 22:12 15:3 26:13 started 29:25 reminder 11:8 revenue 22:24 sellable 9:8 starting 30:9 13:12 23:6 selling 12:6 22:8 **state** 5:17 11:8 Remote 5:1 revenues 23:12 29:3 20:20 rental 23:1,7 reviewing 5:14 **sells** 7:10 12:21 **stated** 30:17 18:22 repeat 28:5 29:2 statement 20:4 rid 29:1 report 8:6,8,18 September 26:20 24:19 28:19 11:17,18,20 12:2 ridiculous 8:25 set 17:10 24:20 statements 15:18 13:17 14:2,4,15, rolled 9:9 20:1,7 23 17:22 18:10, **sheets** 19:23 11,13 23:17,18 room 13:13 **states** 25:15 shelf 22:7 24:13 26:21 27:1, run 25:11 29:8 **stating** 25:10 2 28:8,9 30:22 **show** 24:23 25:12 31:9 32:5 26:11 running 9:12 stenographer 13:14 reported 8:3,5 showed 20:17 10:9 13:8,9 20:9, 25:8 steps 29:22 16,20,22 21:3,10

store 7:10,23 27:3 30:4 transcription working 7:9 8:13 11:10 13:15 12:6,8,21,23 taxable 6:8 8:19 19:17 22:25 25:11 Υ 13:8 16:1,13 truck 12:18 strange 25:13 21:11 22:22 23:1 true 25:2 30:24 31:6,16 year 8:5 11:25 stuff 9:18 12:7,16, truthful 15:15 26:14 27:3 31:24 22 17:3 27:5 29:2 taxes 28:19 turn 11:10 15:22 years 7:23,24 8:3, **Suazo** 5:24 11:6 taxpayer 25:4 17:7 27:11 10,24 10:10 12:3 19:13,16 28:7 test 22:7 14:5 18:16 28:14, 32:11 16 30:8 31:4,11, testified 6:22 U submitted 6:10, 12 12 12:2 32:19 testify 6:17 understand subsidiary 19:24 testimony 7:3 12:21 31:13 15:12,18 18:5 substantial 24:12 understanding 26:4 32:13 18:5 29:21 **sudden** 25:20 thing 14:24,25 understated 22:4 summary 20:5 28:23 30:13 23:18 unreported 6:7 things 12:9 14:8 21:11 24:11 support 14:10 29:23 thought 16:7 supports 11:21 ٧ **Susan** 5:10 Thursday 5:1,6 vendor 8:20 9:7 swear 6:24 time 6:18 8:22 9:1 17:17 10:3,4,10 11:10 sworn 6:21 15:13 12:11 14:1 17:13 vendors 8:21,25 Synchrony 10:17 19:4,10 25:21 9:6 21:16,18,19, 26:4.6.13 30:17 29:3,4 30:2 20,21,24 22:7 31:1,15,19,22,24 timely 14:19 24:6 32:3 **verify** 21:16 times 12:11 31:14 system 7:13,16, versus 16:18 25:2 18 8:1 11:24 today 5:10 6:6 19:25 24:20 26:2 14:17 18:5 32:14 Victor 5:20 11:22 30:2 **told** 12:11 31:14 W top 12:3 Т total 8:19 15:25 wages 25:12 16:5,13,18 27:1 table 12:9,14 31:2,7,16 wanted 10:4,13 tags 30:12 15:22 16:8 28:23 totaled 21:19 29:12 takes 7:9 totals 11:24 wanting 27:9 **talking** 8:7 18:16 track 29:8 31:25 tax 7:25 18:1 transaction warranted 6:8 19:23 20:3,10,14, 24:23 24:9 15,17,22,24 21:5, 8,17 22:3,23 23:8, transactions words 11:19 10,13,23 24:1 23:11 24:2 work 17:17 18:23 25:5,11,19 26:23