BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF:)			
)			
Κ.	MARA	ACCINI,)	OTA	NO.	18103866
)			
				AI	PPELLANT	Γ.)			
)			

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Sacramento, California

Wednesday, July 20, 2022

Reported by:

SARAH M. TUMAN, RPR Hearing Reporter

Job No.: 371230TA(B)

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF:)
6	K. MARACCINI,) OTA NO. 18103866
7	APPELLANT.)
8)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
16	400 R Street, Sacramento, California,
17	commencing at 11:00 a.m. and concluding
18	at 11:50 a.m. on Wednesday, July 20, 2022,
19	reported by Sarah M. Tuman, RPR, Hearing
20	Reporter in and for the State of California.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
3	Panel Lead:	ALJ KEITH LONG
4		
5	Panel Members:	ALJ JOSHUA ALDRICH ALJ TERESA STANLEY
6		ALU TERESA STANDET
7	For the Appellant:	K. MARACCINI
8	ror the Appellant.	R. MARACCINI
9	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	TOT CITE RESPONDENCE	DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND FEE ADMINISTRATION
11		JARRETT NOBLE
12		STEPHEN SMITH JASON PARKER
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX	
2		
3	EXHIBITS	
4	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-4 were received at page 9)	
5	(Department's Exhibits A-H were received at page 6)	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	PRESENTATION	
11		PAGE
12	By Mr. Maraccini	11
13	By Mr. Noble	19
14		
15		
16	CLOSING ARGUMENT	
17		PAGE
18	By Mr. Maraccini	32
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	Sacramento, California; Wednesday, July 20, 2022
2	11:00 a.m.
3	
4	JUDGE LONG: Then we're ready to go on the record
5	now.
6	We are opening the record in the Appeal of
7	K. Maraccini, OTA Case 18103866. This matter is being
8	held before Office of Tax Appeals. Today's date
9	July 20th, 2022, and the time is 11:00 a.m. This hearing
10	is being convened in Sacramento, California.
11	Today's hearing is being heard by a panel of
12	three Administrative Law Judges. My name is Keith Long,
13	and I will be the lead Administrative Law Judge. Judge
14	Teresa Stanley and Judge Josh Aldrich are the other
15	members of this Tax Appeals Panel. All three Judges will
16	meet after this hearing and produce a decision as equal
17	participants.
18	Although the lead Judge will conduct the hearing,
19	any Judge on this panel may ask questions or otherwise
20	participate to ensure that we have all the information
21	needed to decide this Appeal.
22	For the record, will the parties please state
23	their names, starting with Mr. Maraccini.
24	MR. MARACCINI: Kenneth B. Maraccini.
25	JUDGE LONG: And CDTFA?

1 MR. NOBLE: Jarrett Noble. 2 MR. PARKER: I'm Jason Parker, and we have also 3 have Stephen Smith in the audience with us. 4 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 5 The exhibits for this appeal consist of CDTFA Exhibits A through H. On June 30th, 2022, CDTFA emailed a 6 7 copy of Exhibits A through G to Appellant. On July 14th, 2022, CDTFA submitted Exhibit H, a copy of the revised 8 9 audit work papers. 10 Mr. Maraccini, at the prehearing conference, we requested that you review the exhibits. And now, I ask if 11 12 there are any objections to the exhibits. 13 MR. MARACCINI: No, sir. 14 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. Then they are admitted 15 without objection. (Department's Exhibit Nos. A-H were received in 16 17 evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 18 JUDGE LONG: Additionally, in Appellant's Exhibit 19 Index, Appellant submit -- identified Exhibits 1 through 20 5. CDTFA did not previously raise any objections to 21 Exhibits 1 through 3. In the July 21st, 2022, minutes and 22 orders, it was explained that none of the Appellant's 23 submissions could be identified as Exhibit 4, Mr. Luchin's criminal record. 2.4

We provided time for Appellant to submit this

25

exhibit, and it was received timely. Additionally, the first page of Appellant's Exhibit 1 was inadvertently excluded from the hearing binder. Copies of these exhibits were distributed to the panel members and to CDTFA.

Does CDTFA need any time to review these exhibits?

MR. NOBLE: We do not need any further time to review the exhibits. However, we did have an objection to one of the exhibits that was provided today.

JUDGE LONG: And what is the objection?

MR. NOBLE: The first page of the packet that was provided today -- there's no official name of the document, but it starts off with the following is a list of forms required for transfer of the restaurant.

The CDTFA has concerns with the authenticity of the signature on this document. The signature on this document appears to be a photocopy of the signature on the June 21, 2013, bill of sale, which is Appellant's Exhibit 1. There are fade marks where the pen did not fully contact with the paper, when the signature was being signed, that are identical.

In comparison, if you look at CDTFA's Exhibit B, which is the Lease Transfer Agreement signed by the purchaser, and CDTFA's Exhibit C, which is the alcoholic

beverage transfer application. You can tell that the purchaser's signature, Mr. Valentino -- it does not have the same fade marks on the "V," the "A," or the "L."

Although we're not handwriting experts, we have concerns with the first page of the exhibits that were provided this morning.

Thank you.

2.4

JUDGE LONG: Thank you.

Your concerns are noted and will be considered in the opinion. However, I am going to accept page 1 of the exhibit as it is relevant to the appeal.

Next -- next, Appellant's Exhibit Index identified Exhibit 5 as the business's sales and use tax returns for the purpose of showing that he did not sign or file these returns. The sales and use tax returns were not submitted by either party and are not included as exhibits. However, in our July 1st minutes and orders, we requested that CDTFA review their Appeals Bureau decision and determine whether the question of Appellant preparing and filing returns was in dispute.

Can CDTFA confirm whether this is the case?

MR. NOBLE: Yes. It's not in dispute. We stipulate we did not sign any of the sales and use tax returns during the period in issue.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you.

1	So Appellant's or CDTFA's Exhibits A through H
2	are admitted without objection. Appellant's Exhibits
3	are numbered 1 through 4 are admitted.
4	(Appellant's Exhibit Nos. 1-4 were received in
5	evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)
6	JUDGE LONG: We officially note CDTFA's objection
7	with respect to page 1 of Exhibit 1, which was reviewed
8	today.
9	CDTFA, is the summary of the exhibits I just
LO	provided accurate?
11	MR. NOBLE: Yes, sir.
L2	JUDGE LONG: And, Mr. Maraccini, is the summary
13	of the exhibits that I just provided accurate?
L4	MR. MARACCINI: Yes, your Honor, it is. I have a
15	question, however.
L6	JUDGE LONG: Go ahead.
L7	MR. MARACCINI: I I do have an objection to
18	one of the items, which is the Assignment of Lease.
L9	JUDGE LONG: Okay. Go ahead.
20	MR. MARACCINI: I never signed this document,
21	ever. I have never even seen this document until they
22	submitted it to me.
23	And there's some again, if they're going to
24	talk discrepancies, there's some discrepancies in
25	signatures how my name is printed on one of the

1 documents, which is not -- not any way that I print 2 anything. And again, I was never present at the time this 3 thing was signed. I had no idea that it even existed 4 until I got this, a package, from them after our June --5 July 1st meeting. JUDGE LONG: Oh, okay. Similar to CDTFA's 6 7 objection, we're going to take that under advisement. That will be considered in the opinion. If you'd like to 8 9 discuss it in your presentation, you may; however, I am 10 going to admit the Exhibit as it is relevant to this 11 appeal. 12 MR. MARACCINI: Thank you, sir. 13 JUDGE LONG: Today -- today, we are hearing three 14 issues in this appeal. They are, one, whether Appellant 15 is liable for the tax arising from unreported taxable sales; two, whether any reduction to the measure of 16 17 unreported taxable sales is warranted; and three, whether 18 the negligence penalty is warranted. 19 Mr. Maraccini, you requested approximately 20 30 minutes for your opening presentation, and you may 21 begin when you are ready. 22 MR. MARACCINI: Thank you, sir. 23 /// 2.4 ///

25

///

PRESENTATION

MR. MARACCINI: The first thing is, I sold this business to Mr. And Mrs. Luchin on January 1st of 2013. I have nothing to do with the business. I had no involvement in the business for -- from then on.

I did present them with a bill of sale. I presented them with a promissory note. One of the comments that they gave me was that there was no mention on the note regarding its connection with the bill of sale. However, directly on the bill of sale, it reads, "The purchase price is \$100,000 and will be paid for with a note in that amount at a rate of 3 and a half percent for 60 months."

Again, the transfer of the liquor license -- you have before you the notice that I have been requesting it. But it actually wasn't transferred until 2015, when I received a notice from a gentleman who wished to purchase it from me. At which point, I said, "I don't own it, I sold it with the business."

He sent me some more paperwork, which you can read, that states that the liquor license was given -- was assigned with a lien against it -- was given to a gentleman who had previously sued Mr. And Mrs. Luchin for nonpayment of their wages.

The assignment of lease, as I stated before, I see -- I have two problems with it: Number one, unless they have proof that Mr. Luchin purchased the business from me, as it was my business, why would they not question an assignment of the lease in 2014 if he didn't own the business? He couldn't transfer the lease into his name unless he owned the business.

Lastly, on the -- I was taken to court -- to the Bureau of Labor Commissions on a suit from an employee.

The judgment was in my favor. And one of the comments was that there's no -- they -- they accept the bill of sale.

"It's undisputed that Maraccini sold the business to the Luchin's, effective January 1st, 2013. Submitted into evidence, the promissory note, the bill of sale, and judgment filed against the Luchins, asserted that no employer-employee relationship with the plaintiff did not -- and to control his working conditions."

And lastly, I'm not disputing their amounts because I don't know that. Because I can't tell control of the paperwork or anything to do with the business after January 1st.

However, the gentleman on this, regarding

Mr. Luchin's arrest record -- the gentleman who they -word they took that, no, he did not buy the

business was -- admitted to a bank robbery in Marinda,

California. It was published in several papers.

And lastly, I have several items from

Mr. Luchin's personal -- let's see -- Facebook page, a

number of other things, which you have, where he states

that he's chef and owner of Ottavio Osteria restaurant.

And some of these articles go back to 2010, when we opened

the restaurant.

And lastly, their assumption, apparently, when we had the hearing -- the prehearing hearing, was that

Mrs. Luchin -- Michelle Luchin was my bookkeeper. Well, she kept books for the restaurant, that's true. But

Mrs. Luchin had no authority to sign my signature or my name to any legal document. She did not have a power of attorney.

And I'm -- I'm at fault for not understanding the rules in regards to sales tax filings. But I never submitted any inaccurate or untruthful information because I never saw them, and I never signed them.

As far as the -- as far as the complaint that -- excuse me, your Honor, I have to turn that off -- that -- I have no -- I have no dispute with their figures because I had no way of knowing what those figures were to begin with.

All check statements were sent to Mr. And Mrs. Luchin's home address. And at the time I owned it, I did

nothing more than -- than monthly, I would check the bank statements online to make sure there was no unauthorized or excessively large checks written. And if there were, I could go and see who those checks were written to. But the statements never came to me.

And when we changed the account over on the, I think, January 3rd -- that paperwork disappeared because by the time I was notified I needed it, all the employees at Wells Fargo Bank had changed, and somehow or other, they had no record of the change in checking accounts.

So again, I'm not disputing their numbers. I'm disputing the fact that in any way, shape, or form I'm responsible for them.

Thank you.

2.4

JUDGE LONG: Thank you Mr. Luchin -- I'm sorry -- Mr. Maraccini.

I do have a few questions regarding the sale of the liquor license.

MR. MARACCINI: Yes, sir?

JUDGE LONG: So first, the briefing states you transferred the liquor license to the Luchin's on January 1st, 2013; however, the transfer -- or the intent to transfer, which was recorded with the County, wasn't until 2014. And then additional exhibits that you submitted indicate that the liquor license may have been

sold in 2015.

Can you walk me through the history of the sale of a liquor license? Explain that a little bit to me?

MR. MARACCINI: Yes, sir.

As it states on the bill of sale, "Purchase price -- the sale's to include all food and liquor inventory, all equipment, as well as current cash on hand, receivables. The sellers are responsible for contacting all -- all State and County agencies in change of ownership as well as State Liquor Control Board and Wells Fargo Bank."

To my knowledge, until I was informed -- I was called -- I think it was in April or March or April of 2015 -- a gentleman called and asked me if I would be willing to sell the liquor license. I told the gentleman I don't own the liquor license. I assigned -- I signed an assignment of the liquor license to Mr. and Mrs. Luchin on January 1st of 2013. That was the last I heard from him.

Then I got another call from him saying that Mr. and Mrs. Luchin had attempted to file the change in liquor license -- to change the liquor license and had been notified that the liquor license was -- has been held up on a lien to the gentleman whose name appears on the paperwork.

He told me that, because there was lien --

JUDGE LONG: Mr. Maraccini -- Mr. Maraccini, I'm sorry to interrupt. We just want to make sure that -- that the questions that you're answering are not testimony. If you'd like -- or argument instead of testimony. If you'd like to present them as testimony, we can swear you in as a witness and give you the opportunity to present them as testimony as -- as opposed to -- to simply argument.

However, that also does allow CDTFA the opportunity to ask you questions, also.

2.3

2.4

MR. MARACCINI: I'm sorry, sir. You asked me to explain.

JUDGE LONG: I -- I know. However, I want to make sure that I'm clear that this explanation, as it is now, is presented -- or is accepted as argument as opposed to fact. And if you would like us to consider your testimony as evidence, we can do so -- or your answer as evidence, we can do so. However, we have to swear you in as a witness.

MR. MARACCINI: No, sir. It's all -- all the paperwork I provided explains the situation, how -- how the liquor license got transferred, and what the object of that was.

JUDGE LONG: Okay. Thank you. Then you may proceed.

1	MR. MARACCINI: I misunderstood your question.
2	JUDGE LONG: No problem.
3	MR. MARACCINI: Okay.
4	JUDGE LONG: And the my next question with
5	respect, then, to the Liquor License Intent to Transfer,
6	which was signed 2014, as well as the lease transfer is
7	it your contention that those signatures are not your own?
8	MR. MARACCINI: No, sir. I never signed a form
9	on the date indicated. I signed one request for transfer
10	of liquor license on January 1st of 2013. That's the only
11	request for a transfer that I signed, personally.
12	Whether or not somehow or another this is not
13	this is the same form, but changed the date changes, I
14	cannot say. I don't know. But no, sir. I did not sign
15	this form on the date indicated.
16	JUDGE LONG: Okay. Thank you.
17	I would like to allow my panel co-panel
18	members to have the opportunity to ask questions as well.
19	And we'll start with Judge Stanley.
20	JUDGE STANLEY: Good morning, Mr. Maraccini.
21	I just have a quick question about the latest
22	exhibit, the one-page exhibit that you submitted this
23	morning.
24	MR. MARACCINI: Yes, ma'am?
25	JUDGE STANLEY: Do you happen to have any of the

1 responsive documents? 1 through 5? Did the Luchins ever 2 provide you with any of these documents. 3 MR. MARACCINI: No, ma'am. I just simply gave it 4 to them and had them sign for it. So they knew it was, 5 really, just for them to know what's necessary for them to change ownership of the business over. That's all it was 6 7 for. 8 JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you. 9 MR. MARACCINI: You're welcome. 10 JUDGE LONG: Judge Aldrich, do you have any 11 questions? 12 JUDGE ALDRICH: Hi. This is Judge Aldrich. 13 Mr. Maraccini, I just had a quick clarifying 14 question regarding the -- today's submission, the 15 one-pager or the same thing that --16 MR. MARACCINI: Yes, sir? 17 JUDGE ALDRICH: -- Judge Stanley was asking you 18 about. 19 So the other -- I noted that the other pages --20 page numbers -- so it's 1 through 4 on Exhibit 1. Does 21 this purport to be an addendum to Exhibit --22 MR. MARACCINI: No, sir. I must have 23 misunderstood. 2.4 But again, it was nothing more than Mr. and 25 Mrs. -- or Mr. Luchin because Mrs. Luchin did not sign

1 it -- but to Mr. Luchin. This is what you need to do to 2 transfer ownership. And I signed a Transfer of Liquor 3 License with that and gave that paper and the original --4 that on to him -- to he and his wife on the 1st. 5 JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. Thank you. 6 MR. MARACCINI: You're welcome, sir. 7 JUDGE LONG: Thank you, Mr. Maraccini. 8 CDTFA, you may begin your presentation. 9 MR. NOBLE: Thank you. 10 11 PRESENTATION 12 13 MR. NOBLE: Appellant operated an Italian 14 restaurant that was audited for the period of April 1st, 15 2012, through September 30th, 2014, which disclosed a deficiency measure of \$395,689 for underreported taxable 16 17 sales as well as a 10 percent negligence penalty. 18 The issues in this case are the date when 19 Appellant sold the restaurant, whether adjustments are 20 warranted to the deficiency measure, and whether the 21 Appellant negligent --22 JUDGE LONG: Excuse me. Can you please speak a 23 little closer to the microphone?

Apologies. Did you need me to

2.4

25

MR. NOBLE:

read -- restate the first paragraph?

JUDGE LONG: Sure.

MR. NOBLE: Appellant operated an Italian restaurant that was audited for the period April 1st, 2011, through September 30th, 2014, which disclosed a deficiency measure of \$395,689 for underreported taxable sales as well as a ten percent negligence penalty.

The issues in this case are the date that

Appellant sold the restaurant, whether adjustments are
warranted to the deficiency measure, and whether the

Appellant was negligent.

With respect to the date the business was sold, according to purchase documents provided by Appellant as Exhibit 1 on January 1st, 2013, Appellant and the purchaser signed a bill of sale which transferred the inventory, equipment, cash, account receivables, and good will of the business for \$100,000, which was secured for a promissory note to be paid out over the course of 60 months. The bill of sale also stated that the sellers are also responsible for contacting all state agencies about the sale as well as the Liquor Control Board and Wells Fargo Bank.

According to Exhibit C, on April 10th, 2010,

Appellant signed a notice of intent to transfer the
restaurant's liquor license, and the liquor license was
later sold in August of 2015. According to a lease

transfer agreement, which has been provided as Exhibit B, on April 29th, 2014, the lease of the business premises was transferred to the purchasers.

2.4

Merchant credit card sales information, which has been provided as Exhibit D, indicates that Appellant was account payee through August 2014. And according to -- to Exhibit E, the business continued to make payments to the Department from the same Wells Fargo checking account throughout the periods at issue.

Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6072 provides that a sellers permit must be held only by a persons actively engaging in or conducting business as a seller of tangible personal property, and any person not so-engaged must surrender their permit.

Section 6071.1 also provides that anyone who fails to surrender his or her seller's permit upon transfer of a business is liable for any tax, interest, and penalty. If the permit holder has actual or constructive knowledge that transferee is using the permit in any manner, including filing sales and use tax returns under the permit number, the liability is limited to the quarter in which the business is transferred into three subsequent quarters.

In addition, business tax is logged by Annotation 535.0090 provides that a sale of a business occurs when a

purchaser acquires all the sellers rights to engage in a business at the given location.

While the January 1, 2013, bill of sale and promissory note establishes that there was an agreement to sell the business, as of this date, there's substantial evidence that the sale of the business was not complete until well after this time. In particular, the lease to the business location was not transferred to the purchasers until April 29, 2014.

The date of the transfer of the lease is compelling evidence that Appellant did not relinquish all his rights to engage in business when the bill of sale was signed on January 1, of 2013. In addition, there's other evidence indicating that the sale of the business was not completed at that time.

The paperwork to transfer the liquor license was not submitted until April of 2014, and according to Section 23300 Chapter 3 Division 9 of the Business and Professions Code, no person can use a liquor license unless they are authorized to do so by the license itself. Thus Appellant was the only person legally permitted to sell alcohol during this time.

Lastly, the funds from all the credit card payments continued to be paid in Appellant's name through August of 2014, and payments were made from the same

checking account throughout the periods at issue.

Appellant's continuing with receipt and control of money from the restaurant sales of tangible personal property is also compelling evidence that there was not a complete transfer of the business on January 1st of 2013.

With respect to the documents that were recently provided, Mr. Luchin, the purchaser, did identify himself as the owner of the business as early as 2010. However, his claims that he was an owner of the business in 2010 do not establish one way or the other that the business was transferred as of January 1, 2013.

I understand that there are now contentions with regard to the signature on the lease -- assignment of the lease as well as the Alcohol Transfer Agreement. The signatures, to us, appear to be uniform.

However, regardless of whether or not the seller signed these documents, there's no dispute that the access to the lease was not transferred on January 1st of 2013, the liquor license was not transferred on January 1st of 2013, and neither were the bank accounts where the funds from credit card transactions.

As such, I do not think the documents that were provided today establish Mr. Maraccini's contentions in this appeal. Accordingly, based on the available evidence, the earliest the business could have transferred

was on or -- on or about April 29, 2014, when the lease was assigned to the purchasers.

2.4

As such, Appellant is directly liable for the tax deficiencies determined for the period April 1st of 2012 through April 29th of 2014.

Furthermore, there is no evidence that Appellant closed his sellers permit with the Department and there's no dispute that the successor continued to file sales and use tax returns under Appellant's permit number after the transfer occurred; thus Appellant had constructive notice that the purchasers were using his sellers permit.

Therefore, Appellant is a predecessor of the business pursuant to Section 6071.1 and is liable for any tax, interest, and penalty incurred by the successor limited to the quarter in which the business was transferred and the three subsequent quarters. This would include the second quarter of 2014 through the first quarter of 2015. Accordingly, Appellant is liable for any tax, interest, and penalty incurred during the -- the entire audit period.

With respect to the measure of tax, inadequate records were provided upon audit. As a result, the Department estimated Appellant's taxable sales by using the restaurant's credit card receipts, which were obtained from merchant Credit card processors.

The Department found total credit card sales for the audit period of just over \$1.1 million. And based on audits of similar businesses, the Department estimated that the credit card sales represented 90 percent of the restaurant sales, and the remainder was in cash. The Department divided the credit card sales by 90 percent resulting in an audited total sales of approximately \$1.2 million.

Next, the Department estimated that 20 percent of the audited sales represented amounts not subject to tax such as optional tips and nontaxable transactions. The Department multiplied audited gross sales of approximately \$1.2 million by 80 percent, resulting in audited taxable sales of \$987,896.

The Department compared audited taxable sales to Appellant's reported taxable sales for the audit period and calculated a difference of \$395,677. This was split up into amounts of \$160,060 for the second quarter of 2012 through the fourth quarter of 2012. A \$138,565 difference for 2013 and \$97,052 difference for the portions of 2014 included in the audit period.

The Department calculated error rates for the liability period by dividing these differences by Appellant's reported taxable sales for the same period resulting in the measure for under reported taxable sales

of \$395,689.

2.4

Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6051 imposes sales tax on a retailer's retail sales of tangible personal property in this state measured by the retailer's gross receipts; and thus the sale is specifically exempt or excluded from taxation by statute. Section 6091 provides that all of a retailer's gross receipts are presumed subject to tax unless the retailer can prove otherwise.

Section 6481 provides that, when the Department is not satisfied with the accuracy of returns, it may base its determination of the tax upon the facts contained in the return or upon any information that comes within its possession.

When a taxpayer challenges a determination, the Department has the initial burden to explain the basis for the deficiency. When that explanation is reasonable, the burden of proof shifts to the taxpayer to establish that the asserted deficiency is not valid. The taxpayer must establish, by documentation or other evidence, that the circumstances it asserts are more likely than not correct.

Limited records were provided during the audit, and as a result, the Department had to use a credit card sales ratio to audit the restaurant's sales. Pursuant to Audit Manual Section 810.12, a credit card sales ratio is

an effective means to establish taxable sales, particularly for restaurants.

2.4

Furthermore, despite a lack of documentation, the Department estimated that 20 percent of audited total sales consisted of amounts that were not subject to tax such as optional tips and non-taxable transactions. Therefore, the deficiency measure represents the best available evidence of Appellant's underreported taxable sales during the liability period; and thus the determination is reasonable.

Accordingly, the burden shifts to Appellant to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the measure is overstated. Appellant has not provided any evidence establishing that the measure is overstated; and thus there is no basis to make adjustments.

As for the negligence penalty, under the Sales and Use Tax Law, taxpayers are required to maintain and make available for examination all records necessary to determine the correct tax liability and all records necessary for proper completion of the sales and use tax returns.

"Negligence" is generally defined as a failure to exercise the care that a reasonably prudent person would exercise under similar circumstance. The negligence penalty it is applicable where a taxpayer is found to be

negligent in keeping records or is found to be negligent in preparing returns or both.

2.4

Generally, a negligence penalty should not be recommended when a taxpayer has not been previously audited, but there are circumstances where a penalty in a first audit is appropriate. For example, a negligence penalty should be upheld in a first audit if the understatement could not be attributed to a bona fide and reasonable belief that the bookkeeping and reporting practices were compliant with the requirements of the sales and use tax law.

We note that Appellant's records were inadequate for sales and use tax purposes. For example, upon audit, Appellant only provided bank statements for January 2012 through January 2013 and a personal federal income tax return for 2014. The incomplete records Appellant provided to substantiate the businesses reported taxable sales is evidence of negligence.

Furthermore, the evidence in this appeal shows that Appellant underreported his taxable sales by approximately 67 percent when compared to reported taxable sales of \$583,000. Appellant's failure to report 67 percent of taxable sales is compelling evidence of negligence.

Lastly, while this is Appellant's first audit,

inadequate records were provided. And the credit card sales information shows that the business received total credit card payments of approximately \$1.1 million during the audit period, yet only reported approximately \$580,000 in taxable sales, or 52 percent, of all credit card transactions. This indicates that numerous taxable sales were not reported during the liability periods at issue.

Therefore, the significant understatement, including the failure to report half of the credit card transactions as well as the lack of records, established that Appellant was negligent and that the understatement could not be attributed to a bona fide and reasonable belief that the business was compliant with the sales and use tax law.

Accordingly, the negligence penalty was properly imposed. For all of the aforementioned reasons, this appeal should be denied.

Thank you.

2.4

JUDGE LONG: Thank you.

I had a question Regarding Appellant Exhibit 3, the labor commissioner's order, which states that Appellant sold the business and that was not in dispute in that case. How does CDTFA reconcile its position with the labor commissioner's order -- finding?

MR. NOBLE: There is no evidence that the

1 purchasers, the Luchins, were -- I believe the 2 commissioner order says that they did not appear. 3 while the order itself says it's undisputed that the business was transferred as of January 1, 2013, from the 4 5 available documentation, it doesn't ever say -- it doesn't seem like anyone was ever there present to confirm or deny 6 whether this transfer actually occurred at that time. 7 Thank you. 8 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 9 I'd like to open up the floor for my panel 10 members to ask questions. 11 Judge Stanley, do you have any questions? JUDGE STANLEY: No, I do not. 12 Thank you. 13 JUDGE LONG: Judge Aldrich, do you have any 14 questions? 15 JUDGE ALDRICH: Hi. This is Judge Aldrich. 16 Yeah. I have a couple of questions for 17 Department. 18 The percentages that you were referencing in your 19 presentation -- were they in reference to the original 20 audit or the revised audit? They're in reference to the revised 21 MR. NOBLE: I believe, from my review of the decision -- I 22 audit. 23 think the numbers are mostly correct, although they might 2.4 have, in error, repeated a series of numbers instead of

25

moving forward.

1 But the percentages that are listed in the 2 decision are correct. And I actually have them right here 3 in front of me, too, if you'd like them -- the actual 4 percentage of error. 5 JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. The percentage of error was -- it was 6 MR. NOBLE: 73.47 percent for the portions of 2012, 63.56 for 2013, 7 and 65.87 for the remainder of 2014. 8 9 JUDGE ALDRICH: Thank you. 10 So Appellant put in dispute the -- the signature, I think, on the lease. Could you tell me, is there 11 anywhere in the evidence the -- how CDTFA came to obtain a 12 13 copy of the lease? The lease transfer agreement? I don't -- there's no indication in 14 MR. NOBLE: 15 the files. I have where they obtained it from. However, they might have received these documents from the 16 17 purchasers or the landlord. I could try and find out. 18 JUDGE ALDRICH: So -- one second. If I could 19 direct your attention to Exhibit 2, page 3, first 20 paragraph. 21 MR. NOBLE: Could you tell me the title of the document? Is that the bill of sale? 22 23 JUDGE ALDRICH: Exhibit 2. Let's see. Exhibit 2 2.4 consists of the liquor license information.

MR. NOBLE: Apologies. And what page was it?

25

1 Yeah. So that would be Exhibit JUDGE ALDRICH: 2 2, page 3, first paragraph. So there's a reference to a 3 Board of Equalization lien through -- I believe, through a 4 bankruptcy filing through the subsequent owner or the --5 yeah. So I guess what I was wondering is, do we know if 6 anything was collected through the bankruptcy that would 7 have impacted the liability for -- the liability period at 8 issue? 9 10 MR. NOBLE: I'm not aware of any collections 11 through the bankruptcy. I do know that we received funds 12 through the sale of the liquor license, and those were 13 applied to the portions of this liability that already went final. 14 15 JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. That's what I was after. Thank you. No further questions from me. 16 17 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 18 Mr. Maraccini, you had asked for ten minutes to 19 make a closing statement. You may begin when you're 20 ready. 21 MR. MARACCINI: All right. Thank you, your 22 Honor. 23 /// 2.4 /// 25 ///

CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. MARACCINI: I -- Mr. Luchin had worked for me from 20 -- 2010 and opened the restaurant. It's under my name, but nobody's going to come to a restaurant opened by a laboratory owner. Mr. Luchin was the face of the restaurant. He's the one they did all the articles about, he was a well-known chef, et cetera, et cetera.

When I sold the business to him on the 1st of January, I should have probably gone through a -- a trust company. But I had known Mr. Luchin. I had no problem with selling him the business. And I gave him the list of what was required of him to transfer ownership.

I never received anything further from any of those organizations regarding whether I had received or hadn't received it. And I went about my life and my other existing business.

Again, I never filed anything with anybody regarding sales taxes. I was unfamiliar with that because I -- my other business was a service business, and no sales tax was required.

And Mr. Luchin had a new system put into the computer before I got -- he -- it told me that the computer system kept track of all the -- all the charges, all the business maintained the inventory, and -- and

computed the sales tax, and put that sales tax in a separate account and was paid to them -- paid to you.

I had no reason to question it, and I had never done it. But I do know that, again, Mrs. Luchin submitted all of the forms. She had no authority to sign my name or to sign for me in any of those forms at all. The only thing they had authority to sign were checks so they could operate the business.

I can supply them with only records for 11, 12 -- 11 and 12 because that's all the records I had personally. All the other records were with Mr. and Mrs. Luchin, and I explained that in the letter to them at the beginning.

Again, as I said in one of the forms I received, they didn't -- they designated that they accepted the bill of sale. But in two or three -- I mean, coming from them. And then they said, well, a sale didn't exist, or the sale wasn't complete.

I have no way in -- they say that the transfer of the lease was in 2014. They -- the liquor license was 2014. Mr. Luchin stopped payment on -- stopped paying me on the note on June of 2014. It just seems like a horrible coincidence that he decided to do all that just before he ceased to make payments to me.

And it's proof of the note I received from the Superior Court. I received a lien against Mr. and Mrs.

Luchin for the balance due on the note, which was \$73,000.

The rest of it -- his -- his figure and everything -- I

can't dispute because I don't have any -- I never had any

of those records.

To -- to say it was negligent, it possibly was.

I knew nothing about how this -- how the forms were filled or what was done. However, I do know that I filed the last federal and state tax return for 2012 and no longer claimed any income or anything from the restaurant.

And again, if they don't like -- if it's something they don't understand, they have the -- the records -- the checkbook records for 2013 to 2014. It would take ten minutes to go over those checking statements and find the fact that Mr. and Mrs. -- or Mr. and Mrs. Luchin paid me the amount required on the note for -- until June -- January of 2013 through June of 2014.

Now, why would they make payments on a business they don't own? It makes -- it makes no logical sense. And the fact that Mr. Luchin filed bankruptcy and listed the note on his bankruptcy file -- Mr. Luchin didn't recognize that he owed the money.

I have nothing else to say. I provided you with all the information I have regarding the sale. The fact that I did not contact any of the people who were supposed to contact -- and I'll say, yes, it's true. I didn't

1	contact them, but I had no reason to believe that Mr. and
2	Mrs. Luchin would not have followed through since they
3	were so anxious to buy the business.
4	Thank you.
5	JUDGE LONG: Thank you, Mr. Maraccini.
6	And CDTFA, did you want to make any final
7	statement?
8	MR. NOBLE: No. Thank you.
9	JUDGE LONG: Okay. Before we adjourn, I want to
10	make sure. Do my co-panelists have any questions?
11	Judge Stanley?
12	JUDGE STANLEY: No, I don't. Thank you.
13	JUDGE LONG: Judge Aldrich?
14	JUDGE ALDRICH: No questions. Thanks.
15	JUDGE LONG: Thank you for thank you to
16	everyone for coming in today.
17	The record is now closed. The Judges will meet
18	and decide your case later on. And we will send you a
19	written decision within 100 days of today.
20	Today's hearing in the Appeal of K. Maraccini is
21	now adjourned. The next hearing will resume at
22	1:00 o'clock.
23	Thank you.
24	MR. MARACCINI: Thank you, sir.
25	(Proceedings concluded at 11:50 a.m.)

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION 2 I, the undersigned, a Registered 3 4 Professional Reporter of the State of California, do 5 hereby certify: That the foregoing proceedings were taken before 6 7 me at the time and place herein set forth; that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to 8 testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the 9 10 proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand, which 11 was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony 12 13 given. 14 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the 15 original transcript of a deposition in a federal case, before completion of the proceedings, review of the 16 transcript [] was [x] was not requested. 17 18 I further certify I am neither financially 19 interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any 20 attorney or party to this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed 21

24

25

22

23

my name.

Dated: August 8, 2022

Kennedy Court Reporters, Inc. 800.231.2682

Sarah Tuman

\$	18,19 24:4 33:9	32 4:18	90 25:4,6
\$1.1 25:2 29:3	2	3rd 14:7	A
\$1.1 25.2 29.3 \$1.2 25:8,13	2 31:19,23 32:2	4	A-H 4:5 6:16
\$100,000 11:12 20:16	20 2:18 5:1 25:9 27:4 33:4	4 6:23 9:3 18:20 400 2:16	a.m. 2:17,18 5:2,9 36:25
\$138,565 25:19	2010 13:6 20:22	700 2.10	accept 8:10 12:11
\$160,060 25:18	23:8,9 33:4 2011 20:4	5	accepted 16:15 34:14
\$395,677 25:17		5 6:20 8:13 18:1	
\$395,689 19:16 20:5 26:1	2012 19:15 24:4 25:18,19 28:14 31:7 35:8	52 29:5	access 23:17 account 14:6
\$580,000 29:4	2013 7:19 11:4	535.0090 21:25	20:15 21:6,8 23:1 34:2
\$583,000 28:22 \$73,000 35:1	12:13 14:22 15:18 17:10 20:13 22:3,	6	accounts 14:10 23:20
\$97,052 25:20	13 23:5,11,18,20 25:20 28:15 30:4	6 4:5	accuracy 26:11
\$987,896 25:14	31:7 35:12,16	60 11:14 20:18	accurate 9:10,13
	2014 12:5 14:24 17:6 19:15 20:4	6051 26:2	acquires 22:1
1	21:2,6 22:9,17,25 24:1,5,17 25:20	6071.1 21:15 24:13	actively 21:12
1 6:19,21 7:2,20 8:10 9:3,7 18:1,20	28:16 31:8 34:19, 20,21 35:12,16	6072 21:10	actual 21:18 31:3 addendum 18:21
20:13 22:3,13 23:11 30:4	2015 11:17 15:1,	6091 26:6	addition 21:24
1-4 4:4 9:4	14 20:25 24:18	63.56 31:7	22:13
10 19:17	2022 2:18 5:1,9 6:6,8,21	6481 26:10	additional 14:24
100 36:19	20th 5:9	65.87 31:8	Additionally 6:18 7:1
10th 20:22	21 7:19	67 28:21,23	address 13:25
11 4:12 34:9,10	21st 6:21	7	adjourn 36:9
11:00 2:17 5:2,9	23300 22:18	70.47.04.7	adjourned 36:21
11:50 2:18 36:25	29 22:9 24:1	73.47 31:7	adjustments
12 34:9,10	29th 21:2 24:5	8	19:19 20:8 27:15
14th 6:7			ADMINISTRATIO N 3:10
18103866 2:6 5:7	3	80 25:13	Administrative
19 4:13	3 6:21 11:13 22:18	810.12 26:25	5:12,13 6:17 9:5
1:00 36:22	29:20 31:19 32:2	9	admit 10:10
1st 8:17 10:5 11:4 12:13,21 14:22 15:18 17:10 19:4, 14 20:3,13 23:5,	30 10:20 30th 6:6 19:15 20:4	9 4:4 22:18	admitted 6:14 9:2,3 12:25

Index: advisement..CDTFA

advisement 10:7 24:3,6,10,12,18 25 29:4 30:20,22 13:10 27:11,13 28:14, aforementioned audited 19:14 bookkeeping 16,20 29:11,20,22 29:16 20:3 25:7,10,12, 28:9 31:10 13.15 27:4 28:5 agencies 15:9 books 13:11 appellant's 4:4 20:19 audits 25:3 6:18,22 7:2,19 briefing 14:20 agreement 7:24 8:12 9:1,2,4 22:24 August 20:25 **burden** 26:16,18 23:2 24:9,23 21:1 22:4 23:14 21:6 22:25 27:11 31:13 25:16,24 27:8 authenticity 7:16 28:12,22,25 Bureau 8:18 12:9 ahead 9:16,19 authority 13:12 applicable 27:25 **business** 11:4,5, alcohol 22:22 34:5,7 6,20 12:3,4,6,7, 23:14 application 8:1 authorized 22:20 12,20,25 18:6 alcoholic 7:25 applied 32:13 20:11,16 21:2,7, aware 32:10 12,17,22,24,25 Aldrich 3:5 5:14 approximately 22:2,5,6,8,12,14, 10:19 25:7,12 18:10,12,17 19:5 В 18 23:5,8,9,10,25 28:21 29:3,4 30:13,15 31:5,9, 24:13,15 29:2,13, 18,23 32:1,15 **April** 15:13 19:14 22 30:4 33:9,12, **back** 13:6 36:13,14 20:3,22 21:2 22:9, 17,20,25 34:8 balance 35:1 35:17 36:3 **ALJ** 3:3.5 17 24:1,4,5 bank 12:25 14:1,9 business's 8:13 **amount** 11:13 argument 4:16 15:11 20:21 23:20 35:15 16:4,8,15 33:1 businesses 25:3 28:14 **amounts** 12:18 **arising** 10:15 28:17 bankruptcy 32:4, 25:10,18 27:5 arrest 12:23 buy 12:24 36:3 7,11 35:19,20 Annotation 21:24 articles 13:6 33:7 base 26:11 C answering 16:3 asserted 12:15 based 23:24 25:2 anxious 36:3 26:19 calculated 25:17, basis 26:16 27:15 asserts 26:21 Apologies 19:24 22 begin 10:21 13:22 31:25 assigned 11:23 California 2:2,16, 19:8 32:19 apparently 13:8 15:16 24:2 20 3:9 5:1,10 13:1 beginning 34:12 assignment 9:18 appeal 2:5 5:6,21 call 15:19 **belief** 28:9 29:13 6:5 8:11 10:11,14 12:1,5 15:17 called 15:13.14 23:13 23:24 28:19 29:17 beverage 8:1 36:20 card 21:4 22:23 assumption 13:8 **bill** 7:19 11:7,10, 23:21 24:24,25 **Appeals** 2:1 5:8, 11 12:11,14 15:5 attempted 15:20 25:1,4,6 26:23,25 15 8:18 20:14,18 22:3,12 29:1,3,5,9 attention 31:19 31:22 34:14 **APPEARANCES** care 27:23 attorney 13:14 3:1 binder 7:3 case 5:7 8:21 appears 7:18 attributed 28:8 **bit** 15:3 19:18 20:7 29:23 29:12 15:23 36:18 **Board** 15:10 audience 6:3 Appellant 2:7 3:7 20:20 32:3 cash 15:7 20:15 6:7,19,25 8:19 **audit** 6:9 24:20,22 25:5 bona 28:8 29:12 10:14 19:13,19,21 25:2.16.21 26:22. 20:2.8.10.12.13. **CDTFA** 5:25 6:5, bookkeeper 24,25 28:6,7,13, 23 21:5 22:11,21 6,8,20 7:5,6,16

Index: Cdtfa's..disappeared

8:18,21 9:9 16:9 19:8 29:23 31:12	collected 32:7 collections 32:10	connection 11:10	D
36:6 CDTFA's 7:23,25 9:1,6 10:6	commencing 2:17	considered 8:9 10:8	date 5:8 17:9,13, 15 19:18 20:7,11
ceased 34:23	comments 11:9	consist 6:5	22:5,10
cetera 33:8	12:10	consisted 27:5	days 36:19
	commissioner	consists 31:24	decide 5:21 36:18
challenges 26:15	30:2	constructive	decided 34:22
change 14:10 15:9,20,21 18:6	commissioner's 29:21,24	21:19 24:10	decision 5:16
changed 14:6,9	Commissions	contact 7:21 35:24,25 36:1	8:18 30:22 31:2 36:19
	-	contacting 15:8	deficiencies 24:4
Chapter 22:18	company 33:11	20:19	deficiency 19:16,
charges 33:24	compared 25:15 28:21	contained 26:12	20 20:5,9 26:17, 19 27:7
check 13:24 14:1	comparison 7:23	contention 17:7	defined 27:22
checkbook 35:12	compelling 22:11	contentions 23:12,23	
checking 14:10 21:8 23:1 35:13	23:4 28:23	continued 21:7	denied 29:17
2110 2011 00110	complaint 13:19	22:24 24:8	deny 30:6
checks 14:3,4 34:7	complete 22:6	continuing 23:2	Department 3:10 21:8 24:7,23 25:1, 3,6,9,12,15,22
chef 13:5 33:8	23:5 34:17	control 12:17,19	
circumstance	completed 22:15	15:10 20:20 23:2	26:10,16,23 27:4 30:17
27:24	completion	convened 5:10	
circumstances	27:20	Copies 7:3	department's 4:5 6:16
26:21 28:5	compliant 28:10 29:13	copy 6:7,8 31:13	designated 34:14
claimed 35:9	computed 34:1	correct 26:21	determination
claims 23:9	computer 33:23,	27:19 30:23 31:2	26:12,15 27:10
clarifying 18:13	24	County 14:23 15:9	determine 8:19
clear 16:14	concerns 7:16		27:19
closed 24:7 36:17	8:5,9	couple 30:16	determined 24:4
closer 19:23	concluded 36:25	court 12:8 34:25	difference 25:17, 19,20
closing 4:16	concluding 2:17	credit 21:4 22:23 23:21 24:24,25	differences
32:19 33:1	conditions 12:17	25:1,4,6 26:23,25	25:23
co-panel 17:17	conduct 5:18	29:1,3,5,9	direct 31:19
co-panelists 36:10	conducting 21:12	criminal 6:24 current 15:7	directly 11:11 24:3
Code 21:10 22:19 26:2	conference 6:10		disappeared
coincidence 34:22	confirm 8:21 30:6		14:7

Index: disclosed..happen

filled 35:6 disclosed 19:15 Equalization existed 10:3 20:4 32:3 existing 33:17 final 32:14 36:6 discrepancies equipment 15:7 experts 8:4 **find** 31:17 35:14 20:15 9:24 explain 15:3 finding 29:24 discuss 10:9 error 25:22 30:24 16:12 26:16 31:4,6 floor 30:9 dispute 8:20,22 explained 6:22 13:21 23:17 24:8 establish 23:10, food 15:6 34:12 29:22 31:10 35:3 23 26:18,20 27:1, form 14:12 17:8, 12 explains 16:21 disputing 12:18 13,15 14:11,12 established explanation forms 7:15 34:5,6, 29:10 16:14 26:17 distributed 7:4 13 35:6 establishes 22:4 divided 25:6 forward 30:25 F establishing dividing 25:23 found 25:1 27:25 27:14 28:1 face 33:6 Division 22:18 estimated 24:23 **fourth** 25:19 Facebook 13:3 document 7:14, 25:3,9 27:4 17,18 9:20,21 front 31:3 fact 14:12 16:16 **evidence** 6:17 9:5 13:13 31:22 35:14,19,23 12:14 16:17.18 fully 7:20 documentation 22:6,11,14 23:4, facts 26:12 funds 22:23 23:20 26:20 27:3 30:5 25 24:6 26:20 32:11 fade 7:20 8:3 27:8,12,14 28:18, documents 10:1 19.23 29:25 31:12 fails 21:16 18:1,2 20:12 23:6, G examination 17,22 31:16 failure 27:22 27:18 28:22 29:9 due 35:1 gave 11:9 18:3 excessively 14:3 Fargo 14:9 15:11 19:3 33:12 20:21 21:8 Ε excluded 7:3 generally 27:22 26:6 fault 13:15 28:3 earliest 23:25 **excuse** 13:20 favor 12:10 gentleman 11:18, 19:22 **early** 23:8 24 12:22.23 federal 28:15 35:8 15:14,15,23 exempt 26:5 effective 12:13 **FEE** 3:10 27:1 give 16:6 exercise 27:23,24 fide 28:8 29:12 emailed 6:6 good 17:20 20:15 exhibit 6:8,16,18, figure 35:2 23 7:1,2,19,23,25 employee 12:9 gross 25:12 26:5, 8:11,12,13 9:4,7 **figures** 13:21,22 7 employees 14:8 10:10 17:22 file 8:15 15:20 **guess** 32:6 18:20,21 20:13,22 employer-24:8 35:20 21:1,5,7 29:20 employee 12:16 31:19,23 32:1 filed 12:15 33:18 Н engage 22:1,12 **exhibits** 4:4,5 6:5, 35:7,19 engaging 21:12 6,7,11,12,19,21 half 11:13 29:9 files 31:15 7:4,7,9,10 8:5,17 ensure 5:20 **hand** 15:7 filing 8:20 21:20 9:1,2,9,13 14:24 entire 24:20 32:4 handwriting 8:4 **exist** 34:16 **equal** 5:16 **filings** 13:16 **happen** 17:25

heard 5:11 15:18 indicating 22:14 22 20:1 29:19 20:25 21:2 22:7, 30:8,11,12,13,15 10 23:13,14,18 indication 31:14 hearing 2:19 5:9, 31:5,9,18,23 32:1, 24:1 31:11,13 11,16,18 7:3 information 5:20 15,17 36:5,9,11, 34:19 10:13 13:9 36:20, 13:17 21:4 26:13 12,13,14,15 **legal** 13:13 29:2 31:24 35:23 Judges 5:12,15 held 5:8 15:22 legally 22:21 informed 15:12 36:17 21:11 **letter** 34:12 **initial** 26:16 judgment 12:10, history 15:2 15 liability 21:21 intent 14:22 17:5 **holder** 21:18 25:23 27:9,19 20:23 July 2:18 5:1,9 29:7 32:8,13 home 13:25 6:7,21 8:17 10:5 interest 21:17 **liable** 10:15 21:17 **Honor** 9:14 13:20 **June** 6:6 7:19 24:14,19 24:3,13,18 32:22 10:4 34:21 35:16 interrupt 16:2 license 11:15,22 horrible 34:22 inventory 15:7 14:18,21,25 15:3, K 20:15 33:25 15,16,17,21,22 ı 16:22 17:5,10 involvement keeping 28:1 19:3 20:24 22:16, 11:6 19,20 23:19 31:24 Keith 3:3 5:12 idea 10:3 32:12 34:19 issue 8:24 21:9 Kenneth 5:24 identical 7:22 23:1 29:7 32:9 lien 11:23 15:23, identified 6:19,23 knew 18:4 35:6 **issues** 10:14 25 32:3 34:25 8:13 19:18 20:7 knowing 13:22 life 33:16 identify 23:7 Italian 19:13 20:2 knowledge 15:12 limited 21:21 21:19 impacted 32:8 items 9:18 13:2 24:15 26:22 imposed 29:16 liquor 11:15,22 L J 14:18,21,25 15:3, imposes 26:2 6,10,15,16,17,20, inaccurate 13:17 labor 12:9 29:21, 21,22 16:22 17:5, January 11:4 10 19:2 20:20,24 24 inadequate 24:21 12:13,21 14:7,22 22:16,19 23:19 28:12 29:1 15:18 17:10 20:13 laboratory 33:6 31:24 32:12 34:19 22:3,13 23:5,11, inadvertently 7:2 lack 27:3 29:10 18,19 28:14,15 list 7:14 33:12 30:4 33:10 35:16 include 15:6 landlord 31:17 listed 31:1 35:19 24:17 Jarrett 3:11 6:1 large 14:3 location 22:2,8 included 8:16 Jason 3:12 6:2 lastly 12:8,18 25:21 logged 21:24 13:2,8 22:23 Josh 5:14 including 21:20 28:25 logical 35:18 **JOSHUA** 3:5 29:9 latest 17:21 **Long** 3:3 5:4,12, **income** 28:15 **Judge** 5:4,13,14, 25 6:4,14,18 7:11 law 5:12,13 6:17 18,19,25 6:4,14, 35:9 8:8,25 9:6,12,16, 9:5 27:17 28:11 17,18 7:11 8:8,25 19 10:6,13 14:15, incomplete 28:16 29:14 9:5,6,12,16,19 20 16:1,13,24 incurred 24:14,19 10:6,13 14:15,20 lead 3:3 5:13,18 17:2,4,16 18:10 16:1,13,24 17:2,4, 19:7,22 20:1 Index 6:19 8:12 **lease** 7:24 9:18 16,19,20,25 18:8, 29:19 30:8,13 12:1,5,6 17:6 10,12,17 19:5,7, 32:17 36:5,9,13,

15 means 27:1 negligent 19:21 occurred 24:10 20:10 28:1 29:11 30:7 longer 35:8 measure 10:16 35:5 19:16,20 20:5,9 occurs 21:25 Luchin 11:4.24 **Noble** 3:11 4:13 24:21 25:25 27:7, 12:3 13:10,12 Office 2:1 5:8 13,14 6:1 7:8,12 8:22 14:15 15:17,20 9:11 19:9,13,24 official 7:13 18:25 19:1 23:7 measured 26:4 20:2 29:25 30:21 officially 9:6 33:3,6,11,22 34:4, meet 5:16 36:17 31:6,14,21,25 11,20 35:1,15,19, 32:10 36:8 one-page 17:22 meeting 10:5 20 36:2 nobody's 33:5 one-pager 18:15 **Luchin's** 6:23 members 3:5 12:13.23 13:3.25 5:15 7:4 17:18 non-taxable 27:6 online 14:2 14:21 30:10 nonpayment open 30:9 **Luchins** 12:15 mention 11:9 11:25 opened 13:6 33:4, 18:1 30:1 nontaxable 25:11 merchant 21:4 24:25 Nos 6:16 9:4 opening 5:6 M Michelle 13:10 10:20 **note** 9:6 11:8,10, microphone 13 12:14 20:17 operate 34:8 made 22:25 22:4 28:12 34:21, 19:23 operated 19:13 maintain 27:17 24 35:1,15,20 million 25:2.8.13 20:2 maintained 33:25 **noted** 8:9 18:19 29:3 **opinion** 8:10 10:8 make 14:2 16:2,14 minutes 6:21 **notice** 11:16,18 opportunity 16:6, 21:7 27:15,18 8:17 10:20 32:18 20:23 24:10 10 17:18 32:19 34:23 35:17 35:13 notified 14:8 36:6,10 **opposed** 16:7,15 misunderstood 15:22 makes 35:18 17:1 18:23 optional 25:11 number 12:2 13:4 27:6 **manner** 21:20 money 23:3 35:21 21:21 24:9 **Manual** 26:25 order 29:21,24 numbered 9:3 monthly 14:1 30:2,3 Maraccini 2:6 3:7 months 11:14 numbers 14:11 orders 6:22 8:17 4:12,18 5:7,23,24 20:18 18:20 30:23,24 6:10,13 9:12,14, organizations numerous 29:6 morning 8:6 17,20 10:12,19,22 33:15 17:20,23 11:3 12:12 14:16, original 19:3 19 15:4 16:1,11, 0 **moving** 30:25 30:19 20 17:1,3,8,20,24 multiplied 25:12 18:3,9,13,16,22 **object** 16:22 Osteria 13:5 19:6,7 32:18,21 33:3 36:5,20,24 **OTA** 2:6 5:7 objection 6:15 Ν 7:9,11 9:2,6,17 Maraccini's Ottavio 13:5 10:7 23:23 **names** 5:23 overstated 27:13, objections 6:12, **March** 15:13 needed 5:21 14:8 14 20 Marinda 12:25 owed 35:21 negligence 10:18 **obtain** 31:12 19:17 20:6 27:16, marks 7:20 8:3 owned 12:7 13:25 obtained 24:24 22,24 28:3,6,18, matter 2:5 5:7 owner 13:5 23:8,9 24 29:15 31:15 32:4 33:6

Index: ownership..rate

ownership 15:10 percentage 31:4, 27:12 35:22 18:6 19:2 33:13 present 10:2 11:7 prudent 27:23 percentages 16:5,7 30:6 published 13:1 Р 30:18 31:1 presentation purchase 11:12, period 8:24 19:14 4:10 10:9,20 11:1 18 15:5 20:12 package 10:4 20:3 24:4,20 25:2, 19:8,11 30:19 16,21,23,24 27:9 purchased 12:3 packet 7:12 presented 11:8 29:4 32:8 16:15 purchaser 7:25 pages 18:19 periods 21:9 23:1 20:14 22:1 23:7 presumed 26:8 paid 11:12 20:17 29:7 purchaser's 8:2 22:24 34:2 35:15 previously 6:20 permit 21:11,14, 11:24 28:4 purchasers 21:3 panel 3:3,5 5:11, 16,18,19,21 24:7, 22:9 24:2,11 30:1 15,19 7:4 17:17 9,11 price 11:12 15:6 31:17 30:9 permitted 22:21 **print** 10:1 purport 18:21 paper 7:21 19:3 **person** 21:13 printed 9:25 purpose 8:14 **papers** 6:9 13:1 22:19,21 27:23 problem 17:2 purposes 28:13 paperwork 11:21 personal 13:3 33:11 12:20 14:7 15:24 21:13 23:3 26:4 pursuant 24:13 problems 12:2 16:21 22:16 28:15 26:24 proceed 16:25 paragraph 19:25 personally 17:11 put 31:10 33:22 31:20 32:2 34:10 proceedings 34:1 2:15 36:25 Parker 3:12 6:2 persons 21:11 processors Q participants 5:17 photocopy 7:18 24:25 participate 5:20 plaintiff 12:16 quarter 21:22 produce 5:16 parties 5:22 24:15,17,18 **point** 11:19 **Professions** 25:18,19 **party** 8:16 portions 25:20 22:19 quarters 21:23 31:7 32:13 **payee** 21:6 promissory 11:8 24:16 position 29:23 12:14 20:17 22:4 **paying** 34:20 question 8:19 possession proof 12:3 26:18 payment 34:20 9:15 12:5 17:1,4, 26:14 34:24 21 18:14 29:20 payments 21:7 34:3 possibly 35:5 **proper** 27:20 22:24,25 29:3 questions 5:19 34:23 35:17 power 13:13 properly 29:15 14:17 16:3,10 pen 7:20 practices 28:10 property 21:13 17:18 18:11 23:4 26:4 penalty 10:18 30:10,11,14,16 predecessor 32:16 36:10,14 19:17 20:6 21:18 24:12 **prove** 26:8 24:14,19 27:16,25 quick 17:21 18:13 prehearing 6:10 provide 18:2 28:3,5,7 29:15 13:9 provided 6:25 **people** 35:24 R premises 21:2 7:10.13 8:6 9:10. percent 11:13 13 16:21 20:12 preparing 8:19 19:17 20:6 25:4,6, raise 6:20 21:1,5 23:7,23 28:2 9,13 27:4 28:21, 24:22 26:22 27:13 rate 11:13 23 29:5 31:7 preponderance 28:14,17 29:1

Index: rates..signed

rates 25:22 12:16 result 24:22 26:23 9,16,20 28:11,13, 18,20,22,23 29:2, ratio 26:24,25 relevant 8:11 resulting 25:7,13, 5,6,13 33:19,21 10:10 25 read 11:22 19:25 34:1 relinguish 22:11 resume 36:21 reads 11:11 **Sarah** 2:19 remainder 25:5 retail 26:3 ready 5:4 10:21 satisfied 26:11 31:8 retailer 26:8 32:20 **Section** 21:10,15 repeated 30:24 reason 34:3 36:1 retailer's 26:3,4,7 22:18 24:13 26:2, 6,10,25 report 28:22 29:9 reasonable 26:17 return 26:13 secured 20:16 27:10 28:9 29:12 reported 2:19 28:16 35:8 25:16,24,25 sell 15:15 22:5,22 reasons 29:16 returns 8:14,15, 28:17,21 29:4,7 20.24 21:20 24:9 receipt 23:2 seller 21:12 23:16 Reporter 2:20 26:11 27:21 28:2 **seller's** 21:16 receipts 24:24 reporting 28:9 Revenue 21:10 26:5,7 26:2 **sellers** 15:8 20:18 represented receivables 15:8 21:11 22:1 24:7, 25:4,10 review 6:11 7:6,9 20:15 11 8:18 30:22 represents 27:7 received 4:4,5 selling 33:12 reviewed 9:7 6:16 7:1 9:4 11:18 request 17:9,11 send 36:18 29:2 31:16 32:11 revised 6:8 30:20, requested 6:11 33:14,15,16 **sense** 35:18 21 8:18 10:19 34:13,24,25 rights 22:1,12 separate 34:2 requesting 11:16 recently 23:6 robbery 12:25 September 19:15 required 7:15 recognize 35:21 20:4 27:17 33:13,21 **RPR** 2:19 recommended 35:15 **series** 30:24 rules 13:16 28:4 requirements service 33:20 reconcile 29:23 28:10 S **shape** 14:12 record 5:4,6,22 respect 9:7 17:5 **shifts** 26:18 27:11 6:24 12:23 14:10 20:11 23:6 24:21 Sacramento 2:16 36:17 showing 8:14 5:1.10 Respondent 3:9 recorded 14:23 **shows** 28:19 29:2 **sale** 7:19 11:7,11 responsible 12:11,14 14:17 records 24:22 14:13 15:8 20:19 **sign** 8:14,23 13:12 15:2,5 20:14,18, 26:22 27:18,19 17:14 18:4,25 responsive 18:1 20 21:25 22:3,6, 28:1,12,16 29:1, 34:5,6,7 12,14 26:5 31:22 10 34:9,10,11 rest 35:2 signature 7:17, 32:12 34:15,16 35:4,12 restate 19:25 18,21 8:2 13:12 35:23 reduction 10:16 23:13 31:10 restaurant 7:15 **sale's** 15:6 reference 30:19, signatures 9:25 13:5,7,11 19:14, **sales** 8:13,15,23 21 32:2 17:7 23:15 19 20:3,8 23:3 10:16,17 13:16 25:5 33:4,5,7 35:9 referencing signed 7:22,24 19:17 20:6 21:4, 30:18 restaurant's 9:20 10:3 13:18 20 23:3 24:8,23 20:24 24:24 26:24 15:16 17:6,8,9,11 25:1,4,5,6,7,10, regard 23:13 19:2 20:14,23 12,14,15,16,24,25 restaurants 27:2 relationship 22:13 23:17 26:3,24,25 27:1,5,

Index: significant..upheld

significant 29:8 Street 2:16 33:21 34:1 35:8 **transfer** 7:15,24 8:1 11:15 12:6 similar 10:6 25:3 subject 25:10 taxable 10:15,17 14:22,23 17:5,6,9, 27:24 26:8 27:5 19:16 20:5 24:23 11 19:2 20:23 25:13,15,16,24,25 **simply** 16:8 18:3 submission 21:1,17 22:10,16 27:1,8 28:17,20, 18:14 23:5,14 24:10 sir 6:13 9:11 21,23 29:5,6 30:7 31:13 33:13 submissions 10:12,22 14:19 taxation 21:10 34:18 6:23 15:4 16:11,20 26:2,6 transferee 21:19 17:8,14 18:16,22 submit 6:19,25 taxes 33:19 19:6 36:24 transferred 11:17 submitted 6:8 situation 16:21 taxpayer 26:15, 14:21 16:22 20:14 8:16 9:22 12:13 18,19 27:25 28:4 21:3.22 22:8 Smith 3:12 6:3 13:17 14:25 17:22 23:11,18,19,25 22:17 34:4 taxpayers 27:17 so-engaged 24:16 30:4 21:13 subsequent ten 20:6 32:18 true 13:11 35:25 21:23 24:16 32:4 35:13 sold 11:3,20 12:12 trust 33:10 substantial 22:5 Teresa 3:5 5:14 15:1 19:19 20:8, **Tuman** 2:19 11,25 29:22 33:9 substantiate testimony 16:4,5, turn 13:20 speak 19:22 28:17 7,17 specifically 26:5 successor 24:8, thing 10:3 11:3 U 14 18:15 34:7 **split** 25:17 **sued** 11:24 things 13:4 **Stanley** 3:5 5:14 unauthorized **suit** 12:9 time 5:9 6:25 7:6,8 17:19,20,25 18:8, 14:2 17 30:11,12 10:2 13:25 14:8 **summary** 9:9,12 underreported 36:11,12 22:7,15,22 30:7 19:16 20:5 27:8 Superior 34:25 **start** 17:19 timely 7:1 28:20 **supply** 34:9 tips 25:11 27:6 starting 5:23 understand supposed 35:24 23:12 35:11 starts 7:14 title 31:21 surrender 21:14, understanding state 2:2,20 3:9 today 7:10,13 9:8 16 13:15 5:22 15:9,10 10:13 23:23 20:19 26:4 35:8 36:16,19 swear 16:6,18 understatement 28:8 29:8,11 stated 12:1 20:18 today's 5:8,11 **system** 33:22,24 18:14 36:20 undisputed statement 32:19 12:12 30:3 Т 36:7 **told** 15:15,25 33:23 unfamiliar 33:19 statements 13:24 talk 9:24 14:2,5 28:14 total 25:1,7 27:4 uniform 23:15 35:14 29:2 tangible 21:13 unreported 23:3 26:3 states 11:22 13:4 track 33:24 10:15,17 14:20 15:5 29:21 tax 2:1 3:10 5:8,15 transactions untruthful 13:17 8:13,15,23 10:15 statute 26:6 23:21 25:11 27:6 upheld 28:7 13:16 21:17,20,24 29:6,10 Stephen 3:12 6:3 24:3,9,14,19,21 **TRANSCRIPT** 25:10 26:3,8,12 stipulate 8:23 2:15 27:5,17,19,20 stopped 34:20 28:11,13,15 29:14

٧

Valentino 8:2

valid 26:19

W

wages 11:25

walk 15:2

warranted 10:17, 18 19:20 20:9

Wednesday 2:18 5:1

well-known 33:8

Wells 14:9 15:10 20:21 21:8

wife 19:4

wished 11:18

wondering 32:6

word 12:24

work 6:9

worked 33:3

working 12:17

written 14:3,4 36:19