BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF,)			
_	~)			01000111
т.	GILI	BERT,)	OTA	NO.	21088441
				A.	PPELLAN'	т.)			
)			

TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Tuesday, July 26, 2022

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,)
6	T. GILBERT,) OTA NO. 2188441
7	APPELLANT.)
8))
9	/
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Transcript of Electronic Proceedings,
15	taken in the State of California, commencing
16	at 2:08 p.m. and concluding at 2:18 p.m. on
17	Tuesday, July 26, 2022, reported by Ernalyn M.
18	Alonzo, Hearing Reporter, in and for the State
19	of California.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	JOHN JOHNSON
4	For the Appellant:	T. GILBERT
5		
6	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD
7		TOPHER TUTTLE MARIA BROSTERHOUS
8		
9		
10		
11		
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 1-8 were received at page 6.)
6	(Department's Exhibits A-G were received at page 6.)
7	
8	PRESENTATION
9	
10	<u>PAGE</u>
11	By Mr. Gilbert 7
12	By Mr. Tuttle 9
13	
14	CLOSING STATEMENT
15	<u>PAGE</u>
16	By Mr. Gilbert 11
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	California; Tuesday, July 26, 2022
2	2:08 p.m.
3	
4	JUDGE JOHNSON: We're now going on the record.
5	This is the Appeal of Gilbert, OTA Case Number
6	21088441. It is 2:08 on July 26th, 2022, and this hearing
7	is being conducted electronically lead by myself,
8	Judge Johnson, here in Sacramento, California.
9	This appeal is being heard and decided by a
10	single Administrative Law Judge under the Office of Tax
11	Appeals Small Case Program. I just remind today's
12	participants and viewers that the Office of Tax Appeals is
13	not a court. It's an independent appeals body. The
14	office is staffed by tax experts and is independent of the
15	State's tax agencies.
16	In other words, OTA does not engage in any ex
17	parte communications with either party, and our decision
18	will be based on the arguments and evidence provided by
19	the parties on appeal, in conjunction with the appropriate
20	application of the law.
21	Let me have the parties introduce themselves.
22	I'll start with Mr. Gilbert.
23	MR. GILBERT: Yes. Hi. My name is Travis
24	Gilbert, Jr.
25	JUDGE JOHNSON: Thank you.

1	And for Franchise Tax Board.
2	MR. TUTTLE: My name is Topher Tuttle.
3	MS. BROSTERHOUS: Maria Brosterhous.
4	JUDGE JOHNSON: Thank you.
5	This is Judge Johnson again.
6	The issue we have on appeal is whether Appellant
7	has shown error in Respondent's proposed assessment with
8	the 2015 tax year, which is based on a federal
9	determination.
10	The parties have provided exhibits. Appellant
11	has provided Exhibits 1 through 8, and Respondent has
12	provided Exhibits A through G. Those exhibits are hereby
13	admitted as evidence into the record.
14	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-8 were received
15	in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)
16	(Department's Exhibits A-G were received in
17	evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)
18	At this stage we're ready for the parties to
19	provide their presentations.
20	And let me ask before we go that way, Respondent,
21	did you have any other questions before we started?
22	MR. TUTTLE: No, sir.
23	JUDGE JOHNSON: Okay. And Appellant Mr. Gilbert,
24	are you ready to begin?
25	MR. GILBERT: Yes, sir. I am.

JUDGE JOHNSON: Okay. Let me have you swear in first. If you could raise your right hand.

TRAVIS GILBERT,

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

JUDGE JOHNSON: Great. You can begin whenever you're ready.

2.4

PRESENTATION

MR. GILBERT: Okay. This will be very -- just very quick on my part. I'm referring to a letter which I had sent to the Tax Appeal Board on December of 2020, which I have a registered -- which I sent by registered mail. And in there I had explained to the Tax Board that I -- about the audit that was in 2015, that was from Mr. Steven Walker there from the IRS. His ID Number is 10018274 -- no, excuse me -- 27847. Let me repeat that, 1001827848.

And I asked for information on the tax year 2015, and he didn't provide me with any of this information. I also asked for the explanation of the taxpayer's Bill of Rights, and on that there I did not receive any

information. I'd made several phone calls to him as well as his supervisor, Ms. Ellen Murphy. And to this date I have yet to receive any information as to how they came up with the amount for the tax year of 2015.

2.4

And it's hard for me to mount a good defense without knowing as to what I'm -- as to what they were allowing and what they were not allowing. And I have yet to hear back from Mr. Walker or from Ms. Murphy here. And as well as I'd asked the California Tax Board if they had any information on this, and I yet to receive a response from them as to why they're basing their findings on what the IRS had to say.

And that's basically all I have. So it's hard for me to mount a defense without knowing as to what I need to provide information for.

JUDGE JOHNSON: This is Judge Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Gilbert.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, sir.

JUDGE JOHNSON: Respondent, did you have any questions for Mr. Gilbert?

MR. TUTTLE: No questions. Thank you.

JUDGE JOHNSON: Okay. This is Judge Johnson.

Mr. Gilbert, can I just clarify that the number you read off for Mr. Walker that was -- not the actual number itself, but what was the reference number again?

1	MR. GILBERT: Okay. This was for on a letter
2	which I'd sent to the Tax Board about the audit for the
3	year 2015 for Mr. Steven Walker, that is his employee ID
4	number.
5	JUDGE JOHNSON: Okay. That's fine. That's all I
6	was looking for there.
7	MR. GILBERT: Yeah. And I'm sorry. I failed to
8	mention the employee part, sir.
9	JUDGE JOHNSON: Not a problem. Okay. Thank you
10	very much.
11	MR. GILBERT: Thank you, sir.
12	JUDGE JOHNSON: That's the only question I had.
13	Let me turn it to the Franchise Tax Board.
14	Mr. Tuttle, if you are ready to begin, you have five
15	minutes. And if you can address at all Mr. Gilbert's
16	concerns that he expressed, that would be helpful.
17	MR. TUTTLE: I will. Thank you.
18	
19	PRESENTATION
20	MR. TUTTLE: Good afternoon. Again, my name is
21	Topher Tuttle, and I'm representing Respondent Franchise
22	Tax Board. And with me is Maria Brosterhous, also of the
23	Franchise Tax Board.

Appellant has established error in FTB's proposed

24

25

The single issue before you today is whether

assessment for the 2015 tax year which was based on a federal assessment. Revenue & Taxation Code Section 18622 requires the taxpayer to concede the accuracy of federal changes or state where the changes are erroneousness.

Under Todd versus McColgan, it is well-settled that FTB's deficiency assessment is presumed correct, and the taxpayer bears the burden of proving error in FTB's determination.

2.1

2.4

In this case, FTB originally received notice from the IRS that it had audited Appellant for tax year 2015 and disallowed certain Schedule C business expenses. FTB then made corresponding adjustments in its proposed assessment.

To speak to Appellant's concerns, these adjustments are listed in FTB's proposed -- Notice of Proposed Assessment, and we also provided the report from the appeals hearing at the IRS level. It's Respondent's Exhibit B, which is eight pages, and it lists the IRS' review of each of the adjustments it made to Appellant's federal tax account for tax year 2015. It lists many of the documents and evidence Appellant provided to substantiate the disallowed adjustments. And it also lists the IRS' determination that he had failed to carry his burden of proof at that level.

Again, FTB made corresponding adjustments in its

1	proposed assessment after it received notice of the
2	federal action. Now, FTB is not bound to follow the IRS'
3	adjustments if Appellant were to establish that any or all
4	of them are erroneous. However, Appellant has not
5	provided any primary source documentation to establish
6	that the IRS's adjustments are erroneous. The
7	unsubstantiated profit and loss statements Appellant has
8	provided on appeal are insufficient to establish his
9	eligibility for the claimed deductions.
10	In addition, although the primary source receipts
11	and expense documents have not been provided in this
12	appeal, the IRS appears to have had access to this

I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

and FTB's proposed assessment should be sustained.

information during its audit and still found it lacking.

Thus, Appellant has failed to satisfy his burden of proof,

JUDGE JOHNSON: This is Judge Johnson. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert, you have up to five minutes if there is anything else you want to respond to that Respondent just said or anything else you would like to add.

23

2.4

25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. GILBERT: No, sir. The only I -- I'm going

back to what I was saying in the beginning when I was reading of -- off from the letter which I provided for the Tax Board was that I have yet to hear back from the IRS as what -- as to why they chose this year, why they chose the -- that I was not allowed the deductions and -- and the hearings which I had asked for from both Mr. Walker and Ms. Ida Murphy here.

2.4

They have yet to respond to my letters and my requests for this information. So it's hard for me to mount a defense for something of which I have no idea.

JUDGE JOHNSON: This is Judge Johnson. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Gilbert.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, sir.

JUDGE JOHNSON: We have all the evidence submitted into the record, as well as the arguments and your briefs and your oral arguments and testimony today. Thank you. We now have a complete record from which to base a decision.

Any final questions before we conclude this hearing, Mr. Gilbert.

MR. GILBERT: No. I would like to say all -- I would like to say once again all the information that which the Tax Board has, just to make sure I did get everything, sir. Because everything I sent to the California Tax Board has been through my registered

letters or through fax. And
JUDGE JOHNSON: All right. Thank you, sir.
MR. GILBERT: Excuse me, Your Honor. And I would
appreciate any help in which they can give me.
JUDGE JOHNSON: Judge Johnson again. Thank you,
Mr. Gilbert.
I know in the record we have all the exhibits,
that I mentioned, A through G that were provided with the
brief, as well as your exhibits 1-8. So that's all the
information that we have as well.
MR. GILBERT: Thank you, sir.
JUDGE JOHNSON: Okay. Any final questions from
Franchise Tax Board?
MR. TUTTLE: No. No further questions.
JUDGE JOHNSON: Thank you.
Judge Johnson again. I wish to thank both
parties again for their efforts in this manner. This
concludes the hearing for this appeal. The parties should
expect our written opinion no later than 100 days from
today. With that, we are now off the record.
(Proceedings adjourned at 2:18)

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 4th day 15 of August, 2022. 16 17 18 19 ERNALYN M. ALONZO 20 HEARING REPORTER 21 2.2 23 2.4 25