BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF:)			
Ε.	BRO	THERTON ,	,)	OTA	NO.	19044661
			Aı	ppeli	lant.))			

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Cerritos, California

Wednesday, August 17, 2022

Reported by:

ALYSSA FULMER Hearing Reporter

Job No.: 38221 OTA(B)

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF:)
6	E. BROTHERTON, OTA NO. 19044661
7) Appellant.
8)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
17	12900 Park Plaza Drive, Suite 300, Cerritos,
18	California, commencing at 1:41 p.m. and
19	concluding at 2:29 p.m. on Wednesday,
20	August 17, 2022, reported by Alyssa Fulmer,
21	Hearing Reporter.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Panel Lead:	MIKE LE
4		
5	Panel Members:	ASAF KLETTER & JOHN JOHNSON
6		
7	For the Appellant:	EDWARD BROTHERTON
8		
9	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND FEE
10		ADMINISTRATION ERIC YADAO
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
-		

1	I N D E X
2	
3	EXHIBITS
4	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-6 were received at Page 6)
5	(Department's Exhibits A-S were received at Page 6)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	PRESENTATION
11	PAGE
12	By Mr. Brotherton 7
13	By Mr. Yadao 27
14	
15	
16	CLOSING ARGUMENT
17	PAGE
18	By Mr. Brotherton 33
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Cerritos, California; Wednesday, August 17, 2022					
2	1:41 p.m.					
3						
4	JUDGE LE: We're now going on the record. We are					
5	Opening the record in the appeal of Brotherton. This matter is					
6	being held before the Office of Tax Appeals. The OTA case					
7	number is 19044661. Today's date is Wednesday, August 17th,					
8	2022, and the time is 1:41 p.m. This hearing's being held in					
9	person in Cerritos, California. Today's hearing is being heard					
10	by a panel of three administrative law judges.					
11	My name is Mike Le and I will be the lead judge.					
12	Judge Asaf Kletter and Judge John Johnson are the					
13	other members of this tax appeals panel. All three judges will					
14	meet after the hearing and produce a written opinion as equal					
15	participants. Although the lead judge will conduct the hearing,					
16	any judge on this panel may ask questions or otherwise					
17	participate to ensure we have all the information needed to					
18	decide this appeal.					
19	Now, for the parties' introductions for the record,					
20	will the parties please state their names and who they					
21	represent, starting with respondent?					
22	MR. YADAO: Eric Yadao, Tax Counsel for Franchise Tax					
23	Board.					
24	JUDGE LE: Thank you, Mr. Yadao.					
25	And for the Appellant?					

THE APPELLANT: Edward Brotherton.

2.

2.4

MR. LE: Thank you, Mr. Brotherton.

Let's move on to my minutes and orders. As discussed with the parties at the prehearing conference on July 20th, 2022, and notated in my minutes and orders, there are potentially four issues in this matter: Whether Appellant has demonstrated error in Respondent's proposed assessment of the additional tax and also whether respondent properly imposed the late filing penalty, the demand penalty, and the filing enforcement cost recovery fee. The parties disagree as to the issues in this appeal.

At this hearing the parties are asked to make a brief statement in their presentation about the issues in this appeal. In addition, the parties may want to discuss the frivolous appeal penalty as part of their presentation.

No witnesses will testify at this hearing for either party. Appellant's Exhibits 1 through 4 and Respondent's Exhibits A through Q were entered into the record in my minutes and orders. After the prehearing conference, both parties submitted two additional exhibits. Neither party submitted an objection. So these exhibits are entered into the record as Exhibits 5 and 6 for the Appellant, and Exhibits R and S for respondent. This oral hearing will begin with appellant's presentation for up to 30 minutes.

Does anyone have any questions before we begin with

1	appellant's presentation?
2	THE APPELLANT: Yes, sir. I have one question.
3	With respect to Exhibits 5 and 6 that were submitted,
4	when I submitted, I believe I was under the impression that I
5	only submitted one exhibit and the there was other exhibits
6	that were renamed or renumbered. So I just wanted clarification
7	on which exhibit constitutes 5 and which exhibit constitutes 6.
8	JUDGE LE: The exhibits that you marked on your on
9	the PDF itself, you marked it as Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3. Those
10	will be remarked to Exhibits 5 and 6 of
11	THE APPELLANT: Okay. Corresponding then?
12	JUDGE LE: Yes.
13	THE APPELLANT: Okay. You
14	JUDGE LE: Any questions from respondent before we
15	begin with appellant's presentation?
16	MR. YADAO: No questions. Thank you.
17	JUDGE LE: Thank you.
18	Okay. In that case, Mr. Brotherton, you have up to 30
19	minutes for your presentation, starting at 1:44 p.m.
20	Please, proceed.
21	THE APPELLANT: Thank you, sir.
22	I'm assuming you all have had a chance to look at the
23	case beyond just a cursory review. I'd like to help orient
24	everyone here as to what I think this case is really all about.
25	It's really quite evident or self-evident, and I don't

think that anyone here will disagree, that the entire point for the collection of taxes is still so the state can pay its debts. If the state was paying its debts in some other fashion, then the collection of taxes would be unnecessary. And as someone who has spent the past 22 years studying the two great pillars of the political philosophy known as the power of the purse and the power of the sword, I have learned that both of these pillars have been completely transmuttered (phonetic) out of existence and this a very, very, serious problem.

2.4

What we have in this case is the power of the sword being used to enforce the power of the purse, which is completely inhibited. Now, as I say that I wouldn't be surprised if anyone would think that the respondents in this case would be the ones who are actually exercising that power of the sword. However, if you can remember the great legal masses or known as the ultimate powers of the hearing of the people, it's perfectly valid and legitimate and acceptable for me to be trying to exercise the power of the sword as well and for the exact same purpose. The question is, is the respondent interpreting the monetary powers of disabilities and the Constitutional relationship with respect to the state's taxing power correctly? Because whether you all agree with me or not, the respondent still has to be right, no matter what.

Now, the Respondent's position and I $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$

JUDGE LE: Hold on. Can you make sure that you speak

into the microphone so that way you can speak up? Thank you.

2.

2.4

THE APPELLANT: Sorry. It's my Indiana accent.

Now, the response to this is that -- and I hope that I articulate this correctly and to the greatest degree possible. So please forgive me if I get something wrong here.

The Respondent's position is that for the tax year in question, I earned a dollar amount in excess of the exemption amount and, therefore, had enough income to trigger it for a filing requirement pursuant to Revenue Taxation Code 18501(a). It's also my understanding that the Respondent's position is that the United States coins and the Federal Reserve notes have been declared by Congress illegal tender for all debts, public charges, taxes, and dues per Title 31 of the United States Code 5103.

And, therefore, since Congress is the one with the exclusive authority to coin money and regulate the value thereof, the states are mandated to accept these bills of credit and force them among their citizens as legal tender for purposes of payment of taxes in order to satisfy the state's debts. And since they are mandated to satisfy the state's debts and taxes are raised to pay these debts, by extension, the collection of taxes for the purposes of state tax enforcement includes the collection of bills of credit in the form of Federal Reserve notes. Even though I did not earn dollars in the Constitutional sense of the term, I did earn Federal Reserve notes in the

Congressional sense of the term. And since it was more than the exemption amount, it triggers the filing requirement and, therefore, the assessment is valid.

2.4

The Respondent then cites Unites States vs. Daly,
United States vs. Griffin, United States vs. Raifman to justify
this position. Now, I touched on these cases a bit in my reply
brief, but I think it's important to expand on these cases a
little bit. The problem with the all three of these cases is
that they all deal with the administration of federal tax issues
and in this case it deals with the administration of tax laws.
The constitution having different effect on the states than the
Federal Government with respect to the monetary powers and
disabilities would, therefore, make these cases inapplicable to
the current case in the general sense.

In United States vs. Daly decided on by the Eighth Circuit, 1973, Daly's thesis was that only legal tender dollars are those which contain a mixture of gold and silver and that only those can, consequently, be taxed. I would not necessarily label it as frivolous. Mr. Daly, however, was a bit misguided and failed to make some very important distinctions.

First, Mr. Daly failed to explain to the Court nor provide the evidence that Congress was denied the power to emit bills of credit in the Constitutional convention when they voted to remove the phrase and emit bills from the first draft of the constitution by a vote of 9 to 2 as evidenced by exhibit --

exhibit -- Exhibit 6 I submitted into the record. Daly and the Court also failed to recognize that even though Congress made tax income received and measure and maker and collect taxes and any article necessary and proper for carrying into restitutions Constitutional powers, this historical fact would have certainly put into question whether or not legal tender character bills of credit in the form of Federal Reserve notes qualify as falling within this Constitutional power.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Reading from an excerpt from the book Pieces of Eight Monetary Powers and Disabilities, the United States Constitution on page 1,349. It's a big book. The author, Harvard Constitutional scholar, Dr. Edwin Vierra, discusses the Daly case and he writes. Congress may tax incomes derived from occupation is illegal under both state and international laws. Yet, this supposed power to require payment of income taxes with currency that is unlawful for the taxpayer to receive in the first instance implies no further congressional license, say, professional assassins, robbers, or extortionists who prey upon society in order to earn statutory taxable income. application of the power to taxation to an article or activity in other contexts are two separate issues. Thus, where Congress's purpose for taxing and presumably thereafter spending Federal Reserve notes not simply to pay the debts and provide the common defense and the welfare of the United States, but instead or in addition to, promote the circulation of the

private banking cartel paper currency, thus, in effect, indirectly creating bills of credit in violation of Article 1 -- Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2. Such taxation would not be necessary and proper, the exercise of any Constitutional power of the -- I'm sorry. Let me rephrase. Would not be necessary and proper, the exercise of any Constitutional power, but rather would be an attempt to subvert a Constitutional disability and, therefore, would be unconstitutional.

2.4

So in affirming Daly's conviction, the Court needed simply to reject his contention that only gold and silver dollars are taxable; and then when received an income subject to or designated immediate exchange for payment of tax, it did not need to transfer or did not need to consider and would violate a traditional candidate for constitution adjudication by considering whether Congress may declare things other than legal gold and silver dollars to be legal tender for purposes other than taxation. Daly then established no precedent for the theory that Congress enjoys the latter power.

With that said, if we take a look at, for example,
United States vs. Raifman, this is a case where the Court
rejected the taxpayer's argument that Federal Reserve notes in
which he was paid were not lawful money for Article 1, Section 8
of the United States Constitution. The taxpayer in this case
failed to articulate the distinction made in Article 1, Section
10, Clause 1, between the two disabilities enumerated in that

section: The disability to coin money and the disability to emit bills of credit. This distinction reveals that the framer viewed money and bills of credit as two different things when contrasted with Article 1, Section 8, where instead of an explicit disability on Congress, there exists the power to coin money. Furthermore, there's no power or any mention of bills of credit in Federal Reserve notes in any part of Article 1, Section 8, nor did the taxpayer make any mention of the vote that took place in the Constitutional convention of stripping of the Congress for emitting bills of credit by a vote of 9 to 2, as mentioned in Exhibit 6. This vote was even discussed in a consecutive opinion in a legal tender case of Juilliard vs. Greenman. A historical fact that was not considered by that majority opinion -- excuse me.

2.4

If the founders intended that bills of credit be a power granted to Congress, then Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5 would include the language and emit bills to make a distinction just like in Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1, but purports the 10th Amendment that this power was denied to Congress by that power to vote in any Constitutional convention and denies the states and, therefore, reserves to the People themselves.

The taxpayer in the Raifman case, although he may have well intended, failed to recognize the questions his arguments truly presented; and, therefore, not providing the Court with enough for a deeper analysis.

The Griffin case I addressed in detail in my brief, but there is one aspect to this case that deserves special attention. Griffin testified to his belief that Federal Reserve notes are not authorized by the constitution because they are not redeemable in species; and, therefore, not subject to taxation. The court's answer was to refer to United States vs. Daly and answer his argument specifically by stating Article 1, Section 10 of the United States Constitution prohibits the states from declaring legal tender anything other than gold and silver, but does not give Congress the power to declare what shall be legal tender for all debts and reference the legal tender cases.

2.4

What the Griffin Court and almost every Court addresses disability in Article 1, Section 10 for treaties, in part, no state shall coin money and emit bills of credit nor make anything but gold and silver coin tender for payment of debts. Griffin and the courts conveniently failed to address the court's power on the states to make gold and silver coin in tender for the payment of those debts.

Then the state has a Constitutional if that -- I'm sorry. I lost my place.

If that Constitutional provision requires no statute to make anything but gold and silver coin tender, then the state has a Constitutional obligation to make gold and silver coin tender. And what this means on a federal level is that the

state is prohibited from coining money and they're not allowed to emit bills of credit, i.e., Federal Reserve notes, and the only thing they are allowed to use to pay their debts is gold and silver coin, then that means there's a Constitutional duty on the Congress to coin the gold and silver so the state can use it to perform their Constitutional duty to pay their debts.

2.4

Furthermore, 31 United States Code Section 5103 in the constitution gives legal tender quality to gold and silver coin even today. It's important also to note that legal tender character has always been offered to silver coin because that's the Constitutional standard and it's always been established as such.

And as I stated earlier, if the purpose is to collect taxes so that the states can pay its debts, then wouldn't the state be limited to the self-same goal as gold and silver legal tender for payment of taxes for the purpose which to pay those debts? Meanwhile, we have this precarious situation where the only legal tender that is being recognized by default are the bills of credit in the form of Federal Reserve notes, and as a result, the states have been -- have this erroneous belief that they must accept these bills of credit because they fail to recognize the -- they fail to recognize their legal tender power and Constitutional duty to make gold and silver coin in tender. And we know that the Federal Reserve notes, legal tender scheme, cannot be a breakthrough requirement. So state's must accept

them and force them onto their citizens because the state is not allowed to use them. The moment the state pays any debt, whether it be your paycheck or his paycheck or even the State Capitol's phone bill, those checks are cashed, Federal Reserve notes sitting in the state's treasury account is emitted as a payment for that debt. Thereby, making it something other than silver and gold coin be tender for the payment of these debts. And it constitutes the states emitting bills of credit as strictly prohibited by two of the three monetary disabilities in Article 1, Section 10.

2.4

So this begs the question, where did this idea come from that the states are mandated to accept bills of credit that Congress makes legal tender and somehow renders their own Constitutional duty to only make gold, silver coin as tender inoperative or having no effect? Surely an act of the legislature can't render a Constitutional provision inoperative. Fortunately, the Supreme Court in Lane County vs. Oregon addresses whether or not Congress can interfere with states enumerating any Constitutional powers. Specifically, an issue of whether or not the act of making greenback legal tender applies to the states.

Now, even though the Court held that Congress did not intend the word debts to include taxes, it went further and said to the extent to the -- I'm sorry -- to the existence of states themselves necessary to the existence of the United States, the

power -- the power of taxation is indispensable. It is an essential function of government. The extent of which, the subject upon which, and the mode in which this shall be exercised and all equally within the discretion of the legislature to which the states commit to the exercise of the power, there is nothing in the constitution which contemplates or authorizes any direct breach of power by national legislation.

If, therefore, the condition of any state in the judgment of this legislature requires the collection of taxes in gold and silver coin or gold and silver coin, it is not easy to see upon what principle the national legislature can interfere. Lane County thus stated the principle of greenbacks -- I'm sorry -- the Congress lacks Constitutional authority to annul or interfere with the exercise of the state's inherent Constitutional powers. By logical extension, the same limitation on the authority of Congress to interfere with the state's inherent governmental powers or privileges must also preclude Congressional interference with the state's disability to duties.

Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1 imposes on the state a disability and a duty with regard to not making anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts. Lane County clearly implied that Congress can require no state to force the United States notes or any congressional obligation or security

upon the state's own unwilling creditors or on the creditors of judgement debtors who seek relief in the state's courts. After all, Constitutional power and disabilities, privileges and duties are all of equal dignity. If Congressional authorization of legal tender notes cannot be tracked on what the constitution empowers states to do, they cannot be tracked from what the constitution unconditionally commands the states not to do either.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

I have learned throughout my life that it's extremely important to take a step back and look at things every once in a while. When you look at the modern day prophecy of what is known as our monetary system and history that got us here, a 10,000-foot view makes the modern day version look like it was written by a drunken sailor, where a shoehorn approach is used to justify the trans modification of our Constitutional monetary system. We looked at cases like Miller vs. United States involving a case where the Appellant attempts to redeem Federal Reserve notes for lawful money which he claims must be redeemed in gold and silver. But instead of redeeming his \$50 gold note for -- a \$50 note for gold and silver, Appellant refused a tender of equivalent of Federal Reserve notes. The Court in this case said appellant's contentions and argument were put at rest close a century ago in Juilliard vs. Greenman in which it was said under the power to borrow a credit -- under the power to borrow on a credit of the United States and thus issue

circulating notes from the money borrowed, its power to define a quality enforces those notes as currency is as broad and like power over the metallic currency under the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. Under the two powers taken together, Congress was authorized to establish a national currency, either in coin or in paper, and to make the currency lawful money for all purposes as regards to national government -- as regards to national government, not states or private individuals.

2.4

The thing that's important to point out here is in the Melon actually said that the -- when the Court ruled that Melon did not have the power to redeem his Federal Reserve notes and lawful money or gold and silver, then they relied on the Juilliard case to make that decision, the Court failed to realize that at that time governmental notes were actually redeemable in gold and silver. So I don't know where the Court actually got that idea.

So the powers precisely described in Juilliard has been delegated to the Federal Reserve system under the provisions of 12 USC, Section 411. Appellants challenged the validity of the legislation, unfortunately, were meritless.

Once again, in the Juilliard case, those notes were actually redeemable.

Let's first address the elephant in the room under this ruling. Title 12, Section 411 reads: "Federal Reserve

notes to be issued at the discretion of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve system for the purpose of making advances to Federal Reserve banks through the Federal Reserve agents as hereinafter set forth and for no other purpose are authorized. The said notes shall be the obligation of the United States and shall be receivable by all national and member banks and Federal Reserve banks and for all taxes, customs, and all other public dues. They shall be redeemed in lawful money on demand by the treasury of the United States and the citywide --

JUDGE LE: Appellant, Appellant, can you slow down because that way -- we do have a stenographer. Thank you.

THE APPELLANT: All right.

2.4

Or at any Federal Reserve bank. The whole system is so screwed up that we have a situation where we walk into a Federal Reserve bank and treasury in DC, pull out a Federal Reserve note that, let's say, is a 10, and tell the person behind the counter I'd like to redeem this 10 for lawful money. You then push the \$10 bill aside or across the counter, and then they give you two 5's on the other side and they call this redeeming lawful money. Or in the Melon case, it was considered a \$50 Federal Reserve note. This is not redeeming anything. I can go down to the 7-Eleven and give the person behind the counter a 10 and he gives me back two 5's. That's called making change.

Furthermore, and so did he just -- and in this

particular instance, did he just redeem Federal Reserve notes for unlawful money or did he just make change? It's the exact same act. The act, by the way, is only allowed to take place at the Federal Reserve Bank of the Treasury of the United States in Washington, DC. So who's going to contact everyone in the country and tell them to stop redeeming everyone's Federal Reserve notes for lawful money when they make change? This is kind of an absurd consequence that comes from twisting the original Constitutional intent and failing to read all of the monetary powers as a whole.

2.4

The contention of the power to issue paper money in the Juilliard decision comes from the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2. This is problematic due to this exact failure on part of the Court. When government borrows money, it issues bonds or notes to the lender to be paid at some later date and times specified by the terms. These bonds and notes are called securities.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 6 gives Congress the power to provide for the punishment for counterfeiting the current coin and securities of the United States. When you read all of the monetary powers and disabilities as a whole, given each provision its full meaning and intent, you will end up with something like what you find on Page 110 in Exhibit 6 where it reads:

The final monetary provision in the constitution

requires little -- please pardon me with this term. I always have trouble with it -- e-x-e-g-e-s-i-s. I can't pronounce it very well. Self-evidently, Article 1, Section, 8, Clause 6, relates in a derivative fashion to the power to borrow monies in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2 out of which arise due to securities of the United States and to the power to coin money regulate the value thereof and the foreign coin in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5, out of which arise the current coin of the United States.

Once again, the framers chose painstakingly precise language referring specifically to the securities and current coin of the United States only and while avoiding such terms such as bills of credit, paper money, currency, or even money in the general sense. This careful distinction between securities and current coin strongly emphasize, once again, that all money in the United States is and must be coined.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 authorizes the Congress to coin money. And Article 1, Section 8, Clause 6 empowers

Congress to punish the counterfeiting of this money alone.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2, authorizes Congress to borrow money. And Article 1, Section 8, Clause 6, empowers Congress to punish evidences of this borrowing alone. But Article 1,

Section 8, Clause 6, does not empower Congress to punish the counterfeiting of anything else, unequivocally implying that the constitution recognizes only mutually exclusive financial

instruments: Money itself composed properly of regulated domestic of foreign coin and securities composed of the appropriate promises to pay borrowed money or, conversely, a security can never be money and the power to borrow money can never function to create money.

To circle back to the question posed at the beginning of my presentation, is the Respondent interpreting monetary powers and disabilities of their Constitutional relationship with respect to the state's taxing power correctly and, as a consequence, did I earn the dollars as defined by Exhibit 1 in the amounts in excess of the exhibit amount to trigger the borrowing requirement? And even if it's determined that I did, how does the state justify taking securities in the form of Federal Reserve notes to satisfy any alleged tax liability, only to turn around and violate Article 1, Section 10 prohibitions by emitting bills of credit and making something other than gold and silver coin tender for the payment of the state's debts?

Fortunately, the state's laws do not support this idea because when you read the various state's statutes that have any anything to do with taxation, revenue raising, payment government employees, pensions, or just any aspect of the power of the purse, all of these statutes are referring to the Constitutional term dollar. A silver coin containing 371.25 grains of pure silver, that is the Constitutional standard by which to regulate all other coins and that's what the

constitution demands, and just as the Revenue Taxation Code 18501(a) states and whenever you see the word, you know that word means the silver coin containing that specific amount of silver, which is the monetary unit of measure for all of their coins.

2.4

So, as a matter of law, the State of California has never demanded bills of credit to be used for the payment of taxes nor to pay its debts. The language in all California statutes, state's statutes regarding monetary matters specifically refers to dollars; i.e., gold and silver coins. So the State of California is not violating the monetary provisions of the constitution; and, therefore, no Constitutional question exists as to any state taxing statute, but they are being violated under the color of law.

For all the reasons stated in my case and in this appeal, the assessment made by the Franchise Tax Board is in error. And I hope that by allowing me to provide just a summary of what I learned over the past few decades regarding this area of law, my hope is that we can come to a better understanding instead of being adversary and work together in addressing the incredibly serious dereliction of the State's Constitution monetary powers.

With this said, I do have a great concern. My concern is the practicality will be viewed as something that could override constitutionality, a doctrine that is unknown to our

laws in our country and a doctrine that is held by many judges and politicians throughout the country. A learned example of this is when in 1987 Judge Robert Bork was asked during a Supreme Court nomination hearing by now President Joe Biden if there was a list of cases that he would consider and overturn. Judge Robert Bork said, quote:

2.4

"I cite the legal tender cases, scholarships suggests that the framers intended to prohibit me for money." But he also went forward and said, "Any judge who today thought he would go back with the original intent ought to be accompanied by a guardian rather than sitting on the bench."

MR. LE: Appellant, it's been about 25 minutes. You have five additional minutes.

THE APPELLANT: It's very disturbing to me that a nominee to the Supreme Court who makes an acknowledgement that there is doubt to the constitutionality of paper money, while in the same breath would choose practicality over constitutionality, puts concerned citizens like myself in an unfortunate position of being a victim of judicial paralysis. Whereby, even though a position even constitutionally sound, as a matter of fact in law, the stakes are far too high for a judge to allow the chips to fall where they may by rendering a decision that aligns with the constitution; thereby intentionally violating the oath to accommodate their own inability to confront doing what is right.

Fortunately, today there is no excuse and no need for concern. Modern technology has made it possible to bring back a sound Constitutional monetary system by digitizing gold and silver deposits and making gold and silver coin a competing currency with the Federal Reserve system as long as the digitized species is maintained in a proper Constitutional standard of 371.25 grains of pure silver.

2.4

A dual pricing structure can be established in both currencies used by all businesses in the State and whichever currency provides the best power, people will gravitate toward that currency, thereby reversing Gresham's law where the good money pushes out the bad. The states can collect the gold and silver digital currency for payment of taxes and the State can then use those taxes to honor its Constitutional duty to make gold and silver coin tender for the payment of those debts. Legislation has already been drafted on both the state and federal levels. The state legislature just needs to adopt it in California.

I hope I can work with the State Franchise Tax Board and the State of California to help get legislation passed. I don't like to express problems without at least trying provide a solution. Thank you and happy to answer any of your questions.

MR. LE: Thank you, Appellant, for your presentation. Let me turn to the panel here to see if they have any

questions for you. 1 2 Judge Kletter, do you have any questions for 3 Appellant? 4 JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. I don't have 5 any questions for Appellant. Thank you, Judge Kletter. 6 JUDGE LE: Judge Johnson, any questions at this time? 7 JUDGE JOHNSON: Thank you. I have no questions at 8 9 this time, thank you. 10 JUDGE LE: In that case, let's turn to the Respondent. 11 Respondent, you have up to 20 minutes for your 12 presentation, starting at 2:11 p.m. 13 MR. YADAO: Thank you. Eric Yadao here for the Franchise Tax Board. 14 15 You asked for a statement of legal issues and I'll state these in a conclusionary form. That is, that Appellant 16 17 has not shown error in FTB's filing enforcement assessment that is premised on appellant's receipt of wage income in tax year 18 2015. And this is based on well-settled law that an assessment 19 20 based on unreported income is to be presumed correct when a 21 taxing agency and introduces a minimum of actual foundation to 22 support the assessment. If it satisfies this burden, the 23 proposed assessment is presumed to be correct. Therefore, it's 2.4 appellant's duty to show an error and he has not done so and he

has not denied receipt of W-2 wage income.

25

1 Second issues are that Appellant has not established 2 reasonable cause to abate the demand penalty or the delinquent 3 filing penalty. It's also well-settled law that when FTB 4 imposes a penalty, the law presumes the penalty is correctly imposed. And, therefore, the burden is on the Appellant to show 5 6 he is entitled to a penalty. 7 JUDGE LE: Respondent, one moment, please. 8 MR. YADAO: Sure. 9 JUDGE LE: Let me just check in with our stenographer. 10 Is everything okay? 11 (Off the record) 12 JUDGE LE: Respondent, are you ready to begin again? 13 MR. YADAO: Yes. 14 JUDGE LE: Okay. In that case, let's go back on the 15 record. 16 MR. YADAO: Okay. The third issue is that Appellant is not entitled to 17 18 relief from the filing enforcement fee which FTB imposed after 19 the Appellant did not file a return within 25 days of FTB's 20 That conclusion is supported by Revenue Taxation Code demand. 21 Section 19254 that, following receipt of information, that Appellant earned income sufficient to determine the tax year 22 23 2015's filing requirement; and in the absence of the record that

the Appellant had filed a tax return, reported that income, FTB

issued a demand that Appellant file a return, establish he had

2.4

25

no filing requirement or provide a copy of the return previously filed. Appellant did not comply. So FTB proceeded to issue a notice of the proposed assessment and the notice of action that is at issue in this appeal today.

2.4

As you have heard, Appellant argues he was not paid within the Constitutional definition of taxable income and, therefore, his wage income is not taxable. This is the type of argument that has been repeatedly rejected by the Office of Tax Appeals, its predecessor, Board of Equalization, the Eastern District of California, the Ninth Circuit, and other federal courts. It is no surprise then that appellant's argument is among those in the IRS's list of frivolous arguments.

FTB, therefore, asks your panel to follow precedents, reject appellant's argument, and sustain the substance of tax. Appellant's arguments also fail to establish that his failure to file a return or, in a timely manner, a demand letter are due to a reasonable cause. Rather, his failure to file a return for the reasons he argues appears to be better characterized as a refusal, conscious disregard or willful neglect. So FTB requests that your panel also sustain the demand in the filing penalties.

As to the filing enforcement fee, FTB properly imposed that fee on a balance of the appellant's failure to comply with that demand and under the law. Once that fee is properly imposed, it does not subject to a payment.

You asked for a comment on it being a frivolous appeal penalty and this is under OTA's discretion on whether that penalty should be imposed or not. I would point your attention to recently submitted Exhibit R, which is the list of each year of which FTB has pursued and finalized filing enforcement action and that represents tax years 2000 through 2019, and Exhibit S which is the list of tax years for which FTB has a record of the Appellant filing a return and you will see that sheet is blank.

2.2

While this is appellant's first appeal of FTB's filing enforcement action, he has offered the same argument on previous filing for some pensions that he has not appealed.

I would like to mention the Ninth Circuit case that has rejected appellant's arguments and I think it contains, I think, powerful language. And it was the case of Kondo and the -- um, the Ninth Circuit said, Kondo is adamant in asserting the unconstitutionality of the taxing system, but the belief in the unconstitutionality of the law no matter how tenaciously held does not excuse its violation if indeed the law is upheld as Constitutional, which in many courts have upheld as constitution.

I am happy to answer any questions your panel may have.

JUDGE LE: Thank you, Respondent, for your presentation. Let me, again, turn to the panel to see if they any questions.

1 Judge Kletter, any questions for Respondent? 2 JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. I have no 3 questions for Respondent. Thank you. 4 JUDGE LE: Thank you. 5 Judge Johnson, any questions for the Respondent at this time? 6 7 JUDGE JOHNSON: No questions at this time. Thank 8 you. 9 JUDGE LE: Thank you. In that case, let's move on to appellant's rebuttal. 10 Appellant, you have up to 15 minutes for a rebuttal 11 12 starting at 2:19 p.m. 13 THE APPELLANT: Okay. Thank you. 14 Um, there's an -- I guess a misunderstanding with 15 regards to the -- I guess the assessment and the use of the phrase -- there's a belief that -- I believe that somehow I 16 didn't earn taxable income or that the taxable income is what is 17 18 at issue here. And I want to make it very clear, the statutes 19 in California discuss and use the language referring to dollars. 20 The dollars can be taxable income and it all depends. But what 21 I'm referring to is the fact -- there -- that that is a 2.2 Constitutional term and it has to have the same meaning today as 23 it did when it was adopted. 2.4 So there is no issue as to whether or not taxable 25 income was made. The question is did I earn a dollar amount in

excess to the exemption amount and knowing that a dollar is that silver coin, knowing that the dollar is coin, knowing that the dollar is the natural coin. It is not a security. It is not a Federal Reserve note. And Federal Reserve notes are what I earned. So it cannot be construed as taxable income. And on a state level it is questionable because the state, again, is prohibited from making anything but gold and silver coin in tender payment of debts. That doesn't mean that debts mean taxation, but it does raise the question as to whether or not they, um -- if the state has to pay its debts in gold and silver coin and no Court has ever argued this issue. They have always glossed over it, the actual corresponding duty, but they always talk about the disability and they go right to the Congressional power to emit bills of credit, which that doesn't exist. But no Court has ever ruled on any issue of dealing with the debate that took place at the Constitutional convention regarding the removal of the language of giving the power to emit bills of credit to Congress.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So that is -- some of these matters are first impression. So the -- I'm not talking about whether or not we're dealing with taxable income. Income embraces a huge swath of things. What I'm talking about is the language in the statute of California refers to dollars and those dollars refer to coin. They have to. Otherwise, how is the state going to reconcile the payment of his debts when he can't collect? Do

the very thing that's required to pay those debts. If the state requires you to pay its debts in gold and silver coin, then it has to collect the gold and silver coin in order to pay it. But since Congress failed in its responsibility, then the state should have been on the phone with the State Senator and called him back home saying, hey, where are my gold and silver coin? I need to use it in order to fulfill my Constitutional duty. So that's a big issue.

2.4

Nor has any Court ever ruled on the issue I raised regarding when the state pays its debts in the Federal Reserve notes or bills of credit. It's literally emitting those gold and silver credit and that's a strict prohibition in Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1.

So you got two prohibitions that the state is actually exercising here, and so that's what -- that's what raises the real question. So it's not -- I'm not dealing with the issue of taxable income. I'm dealing with the question --

JUDGE LE: Appellant, as you're making argument, please face the panel. I'm going to ask the parties not to face each other. Thank you.

THE APPELLANT: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you.

So he raised the issues here. And I'm just talking to him.

Um, so the issues here are really, does the state -- is the state required to take -- to take -- it's one thing to

asses the tax. Okay. You can asses the tax of billy goats. It does not matter. The question is, though, once it is assessed, how in the world is it made? How is the payment made? Because if you're going to ask me for dollars, what are you talking about? Because the law grants Federal Reserve notes to be dollars and also -- actually, no, it doesn't. Federal Reserve notes have never been declared as dollars by the Congress ever. Dollars are gold and silver coin, period, and it's always been that way.

2.4

So when you say dollars, what are you talking about?

Are you talking about Federal Reserve notes? Securities? Bills of credit, which the state can't use to pay its debts? Or are you talking about actual species? So that's where it gets me hung up.

So it is like, even if the assessment was correct, how do you -- how do you actualize it? And these issues I'm raising have never been brought up by the Court, the emission of bills of credit by the state and the duty that the state has in regards to the requirements to use gold and silver coin as the payment of their debts, and these two issues I do believe are matters of first impression.

I have read every case under the sun, moon, and the stars in this matter. I have had a long time and I have parsed them out and I don't -- I have failed to see those particular issues being raised. And what I find is that the Court, as far

as the frivolous argument, and the Secretary of the Treasury or the Internal Revenue Service has a list of frivolous arguments, I have asked the Franchise Tax Board to please provide me specifically what frivolous argument are you referring to because I was literally kind of open. I had that second open when I wrote my protest. I also did it as a petition for a readdress to a grievance. Under the First Amendment, I have a right to do that. But when I wrote the protest, I had that section opened to make sure I was avoiding any possible problem with any frivolous issues. I was very careful about that. When I asked the Franchise Tax Board for that information, I have yet to receive it. So I don't even know what specific argument they're talking about.

2.

2.4

Um, if anything, they have mischaracterized my argument. Maybe not intentionally or anything. I don't believe that, but I still don't know what they're referring to because, um -- and the other issues that when -- um, when I submitted the protest and I got hit with that \$5,000 frivolous submission notice, I asked them to please provide me the information of the specific frivolous submission you claim I made. I will then analyze it correctly, if need be, and then take whatever proper action that I need to take. Because I didn't get that information, I didn't have anything to rely on.

But then the proceeding taxable year, the proceeding tax years I refused to actually submit any protest because of

the fear now instilled in actually submitting the protest and getting hit with another frivolous submission felony because the arguments in this case had not yet been adjudicated. So I didn't know -- there was no doubt I would be hit with another penalty, another penalty, another penalty. So why would I put myself through that?

2.4

So -- so, yeah. The -- I just believed that the -- I wanted to make sure my issues are not being mischaracterized because there are some issues here that are incredibly valid and never been heard by the Court. If you read all of the cases regarding this stuff, you're getting accurate conclusions by the courts; but many cases, their reasonings to reach those conclusions are -- are flimsy. And then you have issues where the arguments made by the defendants are flimsy or the defendant makes a valid point, but then misses another point on another issue.

So these issues are very reckless and very complex, but read in a very simple fashion because the constitution was written for the young, farmers, and the average person. It's not supposed to be thesis on an intellectual manner. It's just supposed be read and understood and those who had lived at the time understood what this stuff meant and it's not that the difficult.

But I want to make sure my issue isn't being improperly characterized. So I want to make it very clear that

1	what I'm dealing with here is the state's disability to make
2	anything a gold and silver coin payment of debt, meaning
3	corresponding duty to make gold and silver coin a legal tender
4	payment of debt, which does not necessarily relate to the
5	collection of the taxes in gold in anything other than gold
6	and silver coin, but it does create a very precarious problem
7	with the state being able to exercise its duty to pay its debts
8	if it doesn't take in the taxes in that form to be able to pay
9	it. The output must equal the input.
10	So that's what I'm that's what I want to make very
11	clear. So thank you.
12	JUDGE LE: Thank you, Appellant, for your rebuttal.
13	For a final time, let me check with the panel to see
14	if they have any questions for either party.
15	Judge Kletter, do you have any final questions for
16	either party?
17	JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. I have no
18	final questions for either of you. Thank you.
19	JUDGE LE: Thank you.
20	Judge Johnson, any final questions for either party?
21	JUDGE JOHNSON: No questions. Thank you.
22	JUDGE LE: Thank you. I have no questions myself.
23	So that will conclude our hearing. Thank you,
24	everyone, for coming in today. This case is submitted on

August 17th, 2022, and the record is now closed. The judges

25

will meet and decide your case later on and we will send you a written opinion of our decision within 100 days. Today's hearing in the appeal of Brotherton is now adjourned. Thank you. Goodbye. MR. YADAO: Thank you. (Conclusion of the proceedings at 2:29 p.m.)

1	CERTIFICATE
2	OF HEARING REPORTER
3	
4	
5	The undersigned Hearing Reporter does hereby certify:
6	That the foregoing was taken before me at the time and
7	place therein set forth, at which time the witness was duly
8	sworn by me;
9	That the testimony of the witness and all objections
10	made at the time of the deposition were recorded
11	stenographically by me and thereafter transcribed, said
12	transcript being a true copy of my shorthand notes thereof.
13	In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name this
14	date: September 9th, 2022.
15	alys -
16	
17	Alyssa Fulmer
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Index: \$10..allowing

\$	2		action 29:3 30:5,
\$10 20:18	2 7:9 10:25 12:3	6	10 35:22
\$5,000 35:18	13:10 21:14 22:5,	6 4:4,5 6:22 7:3,7,	activity 11:20
\$50 18:19,20	20	10 11:1 13:11	actual 27:21 32:12 34:13
20:21	20 27:11	21:18,23 22:3,18, 21,23	actualize 34:16
	2000 30:6	<u> </u>	adamant 30:15
1	2015 27:19	7	addition 6:14
1 6:17 12:2,3,22,	2015's 28:23 2019 30:6	7 4:12	11:25
24,25 13:4,7,16, 18 14:7,14 16:10 17:21 21:13,18	2022 2:20 5:1,8 6:5	7-eleven 20:22	additional 6:8,20 25:13
22:3,5,7,17,18,20, 21,22 23:10,15	20th 6:4	8	address 14:17 19:24
33:13	22 8:5	8 12:3,22 13:4,8,16	addressed 14:1
1,349 11:11	25 25:12 28:19	21:13,18 22:3,5,8,	addresses 14:14
1-6 4:4	27 4:13	17,18,20,21,23	16:18
10 12:25 13:18 14:8,14 16:10	2:11 27:12	9	addressing
17:21 20:16,17,23	2:19 31:12		24:20
23:15 33:13	2:29 2:19	9 10:25 13:10	adjudicated 36:3 adjudication
10,000-foot 18:13		Α	12:14
10th 13:19	3		administration
110 21:23	3 7:9	A-S 4:5	3:10 10:9,10
12 19:20,25 12900 2:17	30 6:24 7:18	abate 28:2	administrative 5:10
15 31:11	300 2:17	absence 28:23	adopt 26:17
17 2:20 5:1	31 9:13 15:7	absurd 21:8 accent 9:2	adopted 31:23
17th 5:7	33 4:18	accept 9:17	advances 20:2
18501(a) 9:9 24:2	371.25 23:23 26:7	15:21,25 16:12	adversary 24:20
19044661 2:6 5:7	4	acceptable 8:17	affirming 12:9
19254 28:21		accommodate	agency 27:21
1973 10:16	4 6:17 22:17	25:24 accompanied	agents 20:3
1987 25:3	411 19:20,25	25:10	agree 8:22
1:41 2:18 5:2,8	5	account 16:5	aligns 25:23
1:44 7:19	E 0.00 7:0 7 10	accurate 36:11	alleged 23:14
	5 6:22 7:3,7,10 13:16 22:8	acknowledgeme nt 25:15	allowed 15:1,3 16:2 21:3
	5's 20:19,23		allowing 24:17

Index: Alyssa..cartel

Alyssa 2:20 29:8,11,14 30:10 average 36:19 **bonds** 21:15,17 33:18 35:1,4,12, **Amendment** avoiding 22:12 **book** 11:9,11 15 13:19 35:7 35:9 Bork 25:3.6 arguments 13:23 **amount** 9:7,8 29:12,15 30:13 **borrow** 18:24,25 10:2 23:11 24:3 В 35:2 36:3,14 21:12 22:4,20 31:25 32:1 23:4 arise 22:5,8 back 18:10 20:23 amounts 23:11 borrowed 19:1 23:6 25:10 26:2 article 11:4,20 analysis 13:25 23:3 28:14 33:6 12:2,3,22,24 13:4, analyze 35:21 7,16,18 14:7,14 borrowing 22:22 **bad** 26:12 16:10 17:21 23:12 **annul** 17:14 balance 29:23 21:13,18 22:3,5,7, **borrows** 21:15 appeal 2:5 5:5,18 17,18,20,21,22 bank 20:13,15 6:11,13,15 24:16 23:15 33:13 breach 17:7 21:4 29:4 30:1,9 articulate 9:4 breakthrough banking 12:1 12:24 appealed 30:11 15:25 **banks** 20:3,6,7 **Asaf** 3:5 5:12 appeals 2:1 5:6, **breath** 25:17 based 27:19.20 13 29:9 asks 29:13 **bring** 26:2 begin 6:23,25 **APPEARANCES** aspect 14:2 23:21 **broad** 19:2 7:15 28:12 3:1 assassins 11:18 **Brotherton** 2:6 beginning 23:6 appears 29:18 3:7 4:12,18 5:5 asserting 30:15 **begs** 16:11 Appellant 2:7 3:7 6:1,2 7:18 asses 34:1 5:25 6:1,6,22 7:2, belief 14:3 15:20 brought 34:17 11,13,21 9:2 30:16 31:16 assessed 34:2 18:17,20 20:10,12 **burden** 27:22 believed 36:7 25:12,14 26:24 assessment 6:7 28:5 27:3,5,16 28:1,5, 10:3 24:16 27:17, bench 25:11 businesses 26:9 19,22,23 29:3 17,19,22,24,25 Biden 25:4 29:2,5 30:8 31:11, 31:15 34:15 13 33:18,21 C **big** 11:11 33:8 assuming 7:22 appellant's 4:4 bill 16:4 20:18 attempt 12:7 California 2:2.18 6:17,23 7:1,15 **bills** 9:17,23 3:9 5:1,9 24:6,8, attempts 18:17 18:22 27:18,24 11 26:18,20 29:10 10:23,24 11:6 29:11,14,15,23 attention 14:3 31:19 32:23 30:9,13 31:10 12:2 13:2,3,6,10, 30:3 15,17 14:15 15:2, call 20:19 Appellants 19:20 19,21 16:8,12 August 2:20 5:1,7 **called** 20:23 22:13 23:16 24:7 application 11:20 author 11:11 32:14,17 33:11 21:17 33:5 **applies** 16:21 34:11,17 authority 9:16 candidate 12:14 approach 18:14 17:14,17 **billy** 34:1 Capitol's 16:4 area 24:18 authorization **bit** 10:6,8,19 careful 22:14 18:4 **argued** 32:11 **blank** 30:8 35:10 authorized 14:4 argues 29:5,18 **Board** 5:23 20:1 carrying 11:4 19:5 20:4 24:16 26:19 27:14 argument 4:16 cartel 12:1 authorizes 17:7 29:9 35:3,11 12:21 14:7 18:22 22:17,20

Index: case..counter

case 5:6 7:18,23, **claims** 18:18 composed 23:1,2 12,21 25:23 30:20 24 8:10,14 10:10, 36:18 clarification 7:6 concern 24:23 14 11:13 12:20,23 Constitutional 26:2 13:12,22 14:1,2 Clause 12:3.25 8:21 9:24 10:23 13:16,18 17:21 18:17,22 19:14,22 concerned 25:18 11:5,8,12 12:4,6,7 20:20 24:15 27:10 21:13,18 22:3,5,8, concluding 2:19 13:9,20 14:20,22, 28:14 30:12,14 17,18,20,21,23 24 15:4,6,11,23 31:10 34:22 36:3 33:13 conclusion 28:20 16:14,16,19 **cases** 10:6,7,8,13 clear 31:18 36:25 17:14,16 18:3,15 conclusionary 14:12 18:16 25:5, 21:9 23:8,23,24 27:16 **close** 18:23 7 36:10,12 24:12 26:3,6,14 conclusions CLOSING 4:16 29:6 30:19 31:22 cashed 16:4 36:11,13 32:16 33:7 **Code** 9:9,13 15:7 **century** 18:23 condition 17:9 24:1 28:20 constitutionality **Cerritos** 2:17 5:1, 24:25 25:16.18 conduct 5:15 coin 9:16 13:1,5 constitutionally 14:15,16,18,23,24 conference 6:4, challenged 19:20 25:20 15:4,5,8,10,23 19 16:7,14 17:11,23 chance 7:22 construed 32:5 confront 25:25 19:3,6 21:19 22:6, contact 21:5 change 20:24 7,8,12,15,18 23:2, Congress 9:12, 21:2.7 17,23 24:3 26:4, 15 10:22 11:2,13 contemplates 15 32:2,3,7,11,24 12:15,18 13:5,10, character 11:6 17:6 33:2,3,6 34:8,19 16,19 14:10 15:5 15:10 contention 12:10 16:13,18,22 **coined** 22:16 characterized 21:11 17:14,17,24 19:5 29:18 36:25 coining 15:1 21:18 22:17,19, contentions 20,21,23 32:18 18:22 coins 9:11 23:25 charges 9:13 33:4 34:7 24:5,10 **check** 28:9 contexts 11:21 Congress's **collect** 11:3 15:13 checks 16:4 contrasted 13:4 11:22 26:12 32:25 33:3 chips 25:22 conveniently congressional collection 8:2,4 14:17 10:1 11:17 17:19, 9:21,23 17:10 **choose** 25:17 25 18:4 32:13 convention color 24:14 **chose** 22:10 conscious 29:19 10:23 13:9,20 circle 23:6 commands 18:7 32:16 consecutive **Circuit** 10:16 commencing conversely 23:3 13:12 29:10 30:12,15 2:18 conviction 12:9 consequence circulating 19:1 comment 30:1 21:8 23:10 copy 29:1 circulation 11:25 commit 17:5 considered **correct** 27:20,23 13:13 20:20 **common** 11:24 34:15 **cite** 25:7 constitutes 7:7 **correctly** 8:22 9:4 **cites** 10:4 competing 26:4 16:8 23:9 28:4 35:21 completely 8:8, citizens 9:18 16:1 constitution cost 6:10 25:18 12 10:11,25 11:10 Counsel 5:22 complex 36:17 12:14,23 14:4,8 citywide 20:9 15:8 17:6 18:5,7 counter 20:17.18. claim 35:20 comply 29:2,23 21:25 22:25 24:1, 23

discretion 17:4 counterfeiting day 18:11,13 delinguent 28:2 21:19 22:19,24 20:1 30:2 demand 6:9 20:8 days 28:19 discuss 6:14 country 21:6 28:2,20,25 29:16, DC 20:15 21:5 25:1.2 20.24 31:19 **deal** 10:9 **County** 16:17 demanded 24:7 discussed 6:3 17:13,23 dealing 32:15,21 13:11 demands 24:1 33:16,17 Court 10:21 11:2 discusses 11:12 demonstrated 12:9,20 13:24 deals 10:10 disregard 29:19 6:7 14:13 16:17,22 **debate** 32:15 18:21 19:11,14,16 denied 10:22 distinction 12:24 21:15 25:4.15 13:19 27:25 13:2.17 22:14 **debt** 16:2,6 32:11,15 33:9 distinctions debtors 18:2 **denies** 13:20 34:17,25 36:10 10:20 **DEPARTMENT** debts 8:2,3 9:12, court's 14:6,18 District 29:10 3:9 19,20,21 11:23 courts 14:17 18:2 14:11,17,19 15:3, department's 4:5 disturbing 25:14 29:11 30:19 36:12 6,14,17 16:7,23 17:23 23:17 24:8 depends 31:20 doctrine 24:25 create 23:5 26:15 32:8,10,25 25:1 deposits 26:4 creating 12:2 33:1,2,10 34:12, dollar 9:7 23:23 20 dereliction 24:21 credit 9:17.23 31:25 32:1,2,3 decades 24:18 derivative 22:4 10:23 11:7 12:2 dollars 9:24 10:16 13:2,3,7,10,15 decide 5:18 derived 11:13 12:11,16 23:10 14:15 15:2,19,21 24:10 31:19,20 16:8,12 18:24,25 decided 10:15 deserves 14:2 32:23 34:4,6,7,8, 21:13 22:13 23:16 decision 19:14 designated 12:12 10 24:7 32:14,18 21:12 25:23 33:11,12 34:12,18 detail 14:1 domestic 23:2 declare 12:15 creditors 18:1 doubt 25:16 36:4 determine 28:22 14:10 currencies 26:9 draft 10:24 determined declared 9:12 23:12 currency 11:16 drafted 26:16 34:7 12:1 19:2,3,6 difficult 36:23 **Drive** 2:17 declaring 14:9 22:13 26:5,10,11, digital 26:13 13 drunken 18:14 **deeper** 13:25 digitized 26:6 current 10:14 default 15:18 dual 26:8 21:19 22:8,11,15 digitizing 26:3 defendant 36:14 due 21:14 22:5 cursory 7:23 29:16 dignity 18:4 defendants customs 20:7 36:14 direct 17:7 dues 9:13 20:8 defense 11:24 disabilities 8:20 duties 17:20 18:4 D 10:13 11:10 12:25 define 19:1 duty 15:4,6,23 16:9 18:3 21:21 16:14 17:22 26:14 defined 23:10 **Daly** 10:4,15,19, 23:8 27:24 32:12 33:7 21 11:1,12 12:17 definition 29:6 34:18 disability 12:7 14:7 13:1.5 14:14 degree 9:4 **Daly's** 10:16 12:9 17:19,22 32:13 delegated 19:19 date 5:7 21:16 disagree 6:10 8:1

	ensure 5:17	10:2 32:1	fall 25:22
	entered 6:18,21	exercise 8:18	falling 11:7
e-x-e-g-e-s-i-s	entire 8:1	12:4,6 17:5,15	farmers 36:19
22:2	entitled 28:6,17	exercised 17:4	fashion 8:3 22:4
earlier 15:13	enumerated	exercising 8:14 33:15	36:18
earn 9:24,25 11:19 23:10	12:25	exhibit 7:5,7,9	fear 36:1
31:17,25	enumerating 16:19	10:25 11:1 13:11 21:23 23:10,11	federal 9:11,23,25 10:9,12 11:7,23
earned 9:7 28:22 32:5	equal 5:14 18:4	30:4,6	12:21 13:7 14:3, 25 15:2,19,24
Eastern 29:9	Equalization 29:9	exhibits 4:4,5 6:17,18,20,21,22	16:4 18:17,21 19:12,19,25 20:2,
easy 17:11	equally 17:4	7:3,5,8,10	3,6,13,15,21 21:1, 4,6 23:14 26:5,17
Edward 3:7 6:1	equivalent 18:21	exist 32:14	29:10 32:4 33:10
Edwin 11:12	Eric 3:10 5:22	existence 8:9	34:5,6,11
effect 10:11 12:1	27:13	16:24,25 exists 13:5 24:13	fee 3:9 6:10 28:18 29:22,23,24
16:15	erroneous 15:20		felony 36:2
Eighth 10:15	error 6:7 24:17	expand 10:7	•
elephant 19:24	27:17,24	explain 10:21	file 28:19,25 29:16,17
embraces 32:21	essential 17:2	explicit 13:5	filed 28:24 29:2
emission 34:17 emit 10:22,24 13:2,17 14:15	establish 19:5 28:25 29:15	express 26:21	filing 6:9 9:9 10:2
	established	extension 9:21 17:16	27:17 28:3,18,23
15:2 32:14,17	12:17 15:11 26:8	extent 16:24 17:2	29:1,20,22 30:5,8, 9,11
emitted 16:5	28:1	extortionists	final 21:25
emitting 13:10	everyone's 21:6	11:18	finalized 30:5
16:8 23:16 33:11	evidence 10:22	extremely 18:9	financial 22:25
emphasize 22:15	evidenced 10:25		find 21:23 34:25
employees 23:21	evidences 22:22	F	flimsy 36:13,14
empower 22:23	evident 7:25	face 33:19	follow 29:13
empowers 18:6	exact 8:19 21:2,14	fact 11:5 13:13	force 9:18 16:1
22:18,21	excerpt 11:9	25:21 31:21	17:24
end 21:22	excess 9:7 23:11	fail 15:21,22 29:15	foreign 22:7 23:2
enforce 8:11	32:1	failed 10:20,21	forgive 9:5
enforcement 6:10 9:22 27:17	exchange 12:12	11:2 12:24 13:23 14:17 19:14 33:4	form 9:23 11:7
28:18 29:22 30:5,	exclusive 9:16 22:25	34:24	15:19 23:13 27:16
10	excuse 13:14	failing 21:9	Fortunately
enforces 19:2	26:1 30:18	failure 21:14	16:17 23:18 26:1
enjoys 12:18	exemption 9:7	29:15,17,23	forward 25:9

Index: foundation..interpreting

foundation 27:21 government high 25:21 income 9:8 11:3, 10:12 17:2 19:8 15,19 12:11 founders 13:15 historical 11:5 21:15 23:21 27:18,20,25 13:13 **framer** 13:2 28:22,24 29:6,7 governmental history 18:12 31:17,20,25 32:5, framers 22:10 17:18 19:15 21 33:17 hit 35:18 36:2,4 25:8 Governors 20:1 **incomes** 11:13 Franchise 5:22 Hold 8:25 grains 23:24 26:7 incredibly 24:21 24:16 26:19 27:14 home 33:6 35:3,11 granted 13:16 36:9 honor 26:14 Indiana 9:2 frivolous 6:14 grants 34:5 10:19 29:12 30:1 hope 9:3 24:17,19 gravitate 26:10 indirectly 12:2 35:1,2,4,10,18,20 26:19 36:2 great 8:5,15 24:23 indispensable huge 32:21 17:1 **FTB** 28:3,18,24 greatest 9:4 hung 34:14 individuals 19:9 29:2,13,19,22 greenback 16:20 30:5.7 information 5:17 I greenbacks FTB's 27:17 28:19 28:21 35:11,19,23 17:13 30:9 **inherent** 17:15,18 i.e. 15:2 24:10 Greenman 13:13 fulfill 33:7 18:23 inhibited 8:12 idea 16:11 19:17 full 21:22 23:18 inoperative **Gresham's** 26:11 Fulmer 2:20 16:15,16 illegal 9:12 11:14 grievance 35:7 function 17:2 instance 11:17 implied 17:24 **Griffin** 10:5 14:1, 23:5 21:1 3,13,17 **implies** 11:17 instilled 36:1 guardian 25:11 implying 22:24 G instruments 23:1 **guess** 31:14,15 important 10:7, intellectual 36:20 general 10:14 20 15:9 18:10 22:14 19:10 **intend** 16:23 Н give 14:10 20:19, imposed 6:8 intended 13:15, 22 happy 26:22 28:5,18 29:22,25 23 25:8 30:21 30:3 **giving** 32:17 intent 21:9,22 Harvard 11:11 imposes 17:21 25:10 glossed 32:12 28:4 heard 5:9 29:5 intentionally goal 15:15 impression 7:4 36:10 25:24 35:15 **goats** 34:1 32:20 34:21 hearing 2:21 5:9, interfere 16:18 gold 10:17 12:10, 14,15 6:12,16,23 improperly 36:25 17:12.15.17 16 14:9,16,18,23, 8:16 25:4 inability 25:25 interference 24 15:3,5,8,15,23 hearing's 5:8 17:19 16:7,14 17:11,23 inapplicable 18:19,20 19:13,16 **held** 5:6,8 16:22 10:13 Internal 35:2 23:16 24:10 26:3, 25:1 30:18 include 13:17 international 4,12,15 32:7,10 hereinafter 20:4 16:23 11:14 33:2,3,6,11 34:8, hey 33:6 includes 9:22 interpreting 8:20 23:7 good 26:11

introduces 27:21 legislation 17:8 18:13 25:15 36:15 Κ 19:21 26:16,20 introductions making 16:6,20 legislature 16:16 5:19 17:22 20:2,23 kind 21:8 35:5 17:5,10,12 26:17 23:16 26:4 32:7 involving 18:17 33:18 **Kletter** 3:5 5:12 legitimate 8:17 IRS's 29:12 27:2,4,6 31:1,2 mandated 9:17, lender 21:16 20 16:12 issue 16:19 18:25 knowing 32:1,2 21:11 28:17 29:2, letter 29:16 **manner** 29:16 **Kondo** 30:14,15 4 31:18,24 32:11, level 14:25 32:6 36:20 15 33:8,9,16 36:16,24 levels 26:17 **marked** 7:8,9 L issued 20:1 28:25 liability 23:14 **masses** 8:15 **label** 10:19 **issues** 6:6,11,13 license 11:17 matter 2:5 5:5 6:6 lacks 17:14 10:9 11:21 21:15 8:23 24:6 25:21 life 18:9 27:15 28:1 33:22, 30:17 34:2,23 Lane 16:17 17:13, 24 34:16,20,25 limitation 17:17 23 matters 24:9 35:10,17 36:8,9, **limited** 15:15 32:19 34:21 13,17 language 13:17 22:11 24:8 30:14 meaning 21:22 list 25:5 29:12 31:19 32:17,22 30:4,7 35:2 31:22 J late 6:9 literally 33:11 means 14:25 15:4 24:3 Joe 25:4 35:5 **law** 5:10 24:6,14, 19 25:21 26:11 meant 36:22 lived 36:21 John 3:5 5:12 27:19 28:3,4 measure 11:3 logical 17:16 **Johnson** 3:5 5:12 29:24 30:17,18 24:4 27:7,8 31:5,7 34:5 long 26:5 34:23 meet 5:14 judge 5:4,11,12, **lawful** 12:22 looked 18:16 15,16,24 7:8,12, 18:18 19:7,13 **Melon** 19:11 lost 14:21 14,17 8:25 20:10 20:8,17,20 21:7 20:20 25:3,6,9,21 27:2, laws 10:10 11:14 member 20:6 4,6,7,8,10 28:7,9, M 23:18 25:1 12,14 30:23 31:1, members 3:5 2,4,5,7,9 33:18 **Le** 3:3 5:4,11,24 5:13 made 11:2 12:24 6:2 7:8,12,14,17 judgement 18:2 24:16 26:2 31:25 **mention** 13:6,8 8:25 20:10 25:12 34:3 35:20 36:14 30:12 judges 5:10,13 26:24 27:6,10 25:1 maintained 26:6 28:7,9,12,14 mentioned 13:11 30:23 31:4,9 judgment 17:10 majority 13:14 meritless 19:21 33:18 judicial 25:19 make 6:12 8:25 metallic 19:3 lead 3:3 5:11,15 10:13,20 13:8,17 Juilliard 13:12 microphone 9:1 learned 8:7 18:9 14:16,18,23,24 18:23 19:14,18,22 24:18 25:2 15:23 16:14 19:6, Mike 3:3 5:11 21:12 14 21:2,7 26:14 legal 8:15 9:18 Miller 18:16 **July** 6:4 31:18 35:9 36:8, 10:16 11:6 12:15, 24,25 minimum 27:21 **iustify** 10:5 18:15 16 13:12 14:9,11 23:13 **maker** 11:3 15:8,9,15,18,22, minutes 6:3,5,18, 24 16:13,20 18:5 24 7:19 25:12,13 makes 16:13 25:7 27:15 27:11 31:11

Index: mischaracterized..posed

paycheck 16:3 mischaracterize Ninth 29:10 30:12, orient 7:23 **d** 35:14 36:8 original 21:9 paying 8:3 nomination 25:4 misguided 10:19 25:10 payment 9:19 misses 36:15 nominee 25:15 OTA 2:6 5:6 11:15 12:12 14:16,19 15:16 notated 6:5 **OTA's** 30:2 misunderstandin 16:6,7 17:23 **g** 31:14 note 15:9 18:19, override 24:25 23:17,20 24:7 20 20:16,21 32:4 26:13,15 29:25 mixture 10:17 overturn 25:5 32:8,25 34:3,20 **notes** 9:11,24,25 mode 17:3 11:7,23 12:21 pays 16:2 33:10 Ρ modern 18:11,13 13:7 14:4 15:2,19, **PDF** 7:9 26:2 24 16:5 17:25 p.m. 2:18,19 5:2,8 18:5,18,21 19:1,2, penalties 29:21 modification 7:19 27:12 31:12 12,15,22 20:1,5 18:15 **penalty** 6:9,15 21:1,7,15,17 paid 12:22 21:16 28:2,3,4,6 30:2,3 moment 16:2 23:14 32:4 33:11 29:5 36:5 28:7 34:5,7,11 painstakingly pensions 23:21 monetary 8:20 notice 29:3 35:19 22:10 30:11 10:12 11:10 16:9 number 5:7 18:12,15 21:10, **panel** 3:3,5 5:10, **people** 8:16 13:21 21,25 23:7 24:4,9, 13,16 26:25 26:10 11,22 26:3 29:13,20 30:21,24 0 perfectly 8:17 33:19 money 9:16 12:22 perform 15:6 oath 25:24 13:1,3,6 14:15 paper 12:1 19:6 15:1 18:18 19:1,3, 21:11 22:13 25:16 period 34:8 objection 6:21 7,13 20:8,17,20 paralysis 25:19 person 5:9 20:16, 21:2,7,11,12,15 obligation 14:24 22 36:19 22:6,13,15,18,19, 17:25 20:5 pardon 22:1 21 23:1,3,4,5 petition 35:6 occupation Park 2:17 25:8.16 26:12 11:14 philosophy 8:6 parsed 34:23 monies 22:4 offered 15:10 phone 16:4 33:5 part 6:15 13:7 moon 34:22 30:10 14:15 21:14 phonetic 8:8 move 6:3 31:10 Office 2:1 5:6 participants 5:15 phrase 10:24 29:8 mutually 22:25 31:16 participate 5:17 open 35:5 Pieces 11:9 parties 5:20 6:4, Ν opened 35:9 10,12,14,19 33:19 **pillars** 8:5,8 Opening 5:5 names 5:20 parties' 5:19 place 13:9 14:21 opinion 5:14 21:3 32:16 party 6:17,20 national 17:7.12 13:12,14 19:5,7,8 20:6 **Plaza** 2:17 **passed** 26:20 **oral** 6:23 natural 32:3 **point** 8:1 19:10 past 8:5 24:18 order 9:19 11:19 30:3 36:15 necessarily 33:3,7 pay 8:2 9:21 11:23 10:18 political 8:6 15:3,6,14,16 23:3 orders 6:3,5,19 24:8 32:10 33:1,2, needed 5:17 12:9 politicians 25:2 **Oregon** 16:17 3 34:12 neglect 29:19 **posed** 23:6

Index: position..receipt

position 8:24 9:6, previous 30:10 27:23 29:3 23:6 24:12 31:25 10 10:6 25:19,20 32:9 33:16,17 previously 29:1 protest 35:6,8,18, 34:2 potentially 6:6 25 36:1 **prey** 11:18 questionable provide 10:22 power 8:6,7,10, pricing 26:8 32:6 11,14,18,22 10:22 11:23 21:19 24:17 11:8,15,20 12:4,6, principle 17:12, 26:21 29:1 35:3, questions 5:16 18 13:5,6,16,19, 19 6:25 7:14,16 13 20 14:10,18 15:22 13:23 26:23 27:1, providing 13:24 private 12:1 19:9 17:1,6,7 18:3,24 2,5,7,8 30:21,25 provision 14:22 31:1,3,5,7 19:1,3,12 21:11, privileges 17:18 12,18 22:4,6 23:4, 16:16 21:22,25 18:3 **quote** 25:6 9,21 26:10 32:14, problem 8:9 10:8 provisions 19:20 17 35:9 24:11 R powerful 30:14 public 9:12 20:7 problematic **powers** 8:16,20 21:14 Raifman 10:5 pull 20:15 10:12 11:5,10 12:20 13:22 problems 26:21 16:19 17:16,18 punish 22:19,22, raise 32:9 19:4,18 21:10,21 proceed 7:20 23 23:8 24:22 raised 9:21 33:9, proceeded 29:2 punishment 22 34:25 practicality 24:24 21:19 proceeding 25:17 raises 33:15 35:24 pure 23:24 26:7 precarious 15:17 raising 23:20 **PROCEEDINGS** purports 13:18 34:16 precedent 12:17 2:16 purpose 8:19 **reach** 36:12 precedents produce 5:14 11:22 15:13,16 29:13 20:2,4 read 21:9.20 professional 23:19 34:22 precise 22:10 **purposes** 9:18,22 11:18 36:10,18,21 12:16 19:7 precisely 19:18 prohibit 25:8 readdress 35:7 **purse** 8:6,11 preclude 17:19 prohibited 15:1 23:22 Reading 11:9 16:9 32:7 predecessor pursuant 9:9 reads 19:25 21:24 29:9 prohibition 33:12 pursued 30:5 ready 28:12 prehearing 6:4, prohibitions 23:15 33:14 **push** 20:18 real 33:16 premised 27:18 prohibits 14:8 **pushes** 26:12 realize 19:15 presentation put 11:6 18:22 promises 23:3 reasonable 28:2 4:10 6:13,15,24 36:5 29:17 promote 11:25 7:1,15,19 23:7 puts 25:18 reasonings 26:24 27:12 30:24 pronounce 22:2 36:12 presented 13:24 proper 11:4 12:4, Q reasons 24:15 6 26:6 35:21 President 25:4 29:18 properly 6:8 23:1 qualify 11:7 presumed 27:20, rebuttal 31:10,11 29:22,24 23 quality 15:8 19:2 receipt 27:18,25 prophecy 18:11 presumes 28:4 question 7:28:19 28:21 proposed 6:7 9:7 11:6 16:11

Index: receivable..silver

satisfies 27:22 receivable 20:6 relates 22:4 3,7,13,15,16,21 21:1,4,7 23:14 receive 11:16 relationship 8:21 **satisfy** 9:19,20 26:5 32:4 33:10 35:12 23:8 23:14 34:5,6,11 received 4:4.5 **relied** 19:13 **scheme** 15:24 reserves 13:21 11:3 12:11 relief 18:2 28:18 scholar 11:12 respect 7:3 8:21 recently 30:4 rely 35:23 10:12 23:9 scholarships reckless 36:17 25:7 respondent 3:9 remarked 7:10 5:21 6:8,23 7:14 screwed 20:14 recognize 11:2 remember 8:15 13:23 15:22 8:19,23 10:4 23:7 Secretary 35:1 removal 32:17 27:10.11 28:7.12 recognized 15:18 30:23 31:1,3,5 **section** 12:3,22, **remove** 10:24 recognizes 22:25 24 13:1,4,8,16,18 Respondent's renamed 7:6 14:8,14 15:7 6:7,17 8:24 9:6,10 reconcile 32:25 16:10 17:21 **render** 16:16 respondents record 5:4,5,19 19:20,25 21:13,18 8:13 22:3,5,8,17,18,20, 6:18,21 11:1 rendering 25:22 28:11,15,23 30:7 21,23 23:15 28:21 response 9:3 **renders** 16:13 33:13 35:9 recovery 6:10 responsibility renumbered 7:6 securities 21:17, **redeem** 18:17 33:4 20 22:6.11.14 repeatedly 29:8 19:12 20:17 21:1 rest 18:23 23:2,13 34:11 rephrase 12:5 redeemable 14:5 restitutions 11:4 security 17:25 19:16,23 **reply** 10:6 23:4 32:3 result 15:20 redeemed 18:18 reported 2:20 seek 18:2 return 28:19,24, 20:8 28:24 self-evident 7:25 25 29:1,16,17 redeeming 18:19 Reporter 2:21 30:8 20:20,21 21:6 Self-evidently represent 5:21 reveals 13:2 22:3 refer 14:6 32:23 represents 30:6 revenue 9:9 self-same 15:15 reference 14:11 23:20 24:1 28:20 requests 29:20 Senator 33:5 referring 22:11 35:2 require 11:15 sense 9:25 10:1, 23:22 31:19,21 reversing 26:11 17:24 35:4,16 14 22:14 review 7:23 **required** 33:1,25 refers 24:10 32:23 separate 11:21 robbers 11:18 requirement 9:9 **refusal** 29:19 Service 35:2 10:2 15:25 23:12 Robert 25:3.6 set 20:4 refused 18:20 28:23 29:1 room 19:24 35:25 **sheet** 30:8 requirements ruled 19:11 32:15 regard 17:22 34:19 shoehorn 18:14 33:9 regulate 9:16 requires 14:22 show 27:24 28:5 ruling 19:25 19:4 22:7 23:25 17:10 22:1 33:2 **shown** 27:17 regulated 23:1 **Reserve** 9:11,23, S side 20:19 25 11:7,23 12:21 reject 12:10 29:14 13:7 14:3 15:2,19, **silver** 10:17 rejected 12:21 24 16:4 18:18,21 **sailor** 18:14 12:10,16 14:10, 29:8 30:13 19:12,19,25 20:2, 16,18,23,24 15:4,

Index: simple..thereof

5,8,10,15,23 16:7, 27:16 32:6,10,24 **submit** 35:25 12:12 23:14 24:16 14 17:11,23 33:1,4,5,10,14,24, 26:19 27:14,18 submitted 6:20 18:19,20 19:13,16 25 34:12,18 28:22,24 29:8,14 7:3,4,5 11:1 30:4 23:17,23,24 24:3, 30:6,7 34:1 35:3, state's 8:21 9:19. 35:17 4,10 26:4,7,13,15 11,25 20 15:25 16:5 32:2,7,10 33:2,3, submitting 36:1 17:15,18,19 18:1, **taxable** 11:19 6,12 34:8,19 2 23:9,17,18,19 substance 29:14 12:11 29:6.7 **simple** 36:18 31:17,20,24 32:5, 24:9,21 subvert 12:7 21 33:17 35:24 **simply** 11:23 **stated** 15:13 sufficient 28:22 17:13 24:15 taxation 9:9 12:10 11:20 12:3,17 suggests 25:7 sir 7:2.21 statement 6:13 14:6 17:1 23:20 27:15 **Suite** 2:17 24:1 28:20 32:9 **sitting** 16:5 25:11 **states** 9:11,13,17 summary 24:17 situation 15:17 taxed 10:18 10:4,5,11,15 20:14 sun 34:22 taxes 8:2,4 9:13, 11:10,24 12:20,23 slow 20:10 13:21 14:6,8,9,18 19,20,22 11:3,15 support 23:18 15:7,14,20 16:8, 15:14,16 16:23 27:22 **society** 11:19 12,18,21,24,25 17:10 20:7 24:8 supported 28:20 solution 26:22 17:5,25 18:6,7,16, 26:13,14 25 19:8 20:5,9 supposed 11:15 taxing 8:21 11:22 **sound** 25:20 26:3 21:4,13,20 22:6,9, 36:20,21 23:9 24:13 27:21 12.16 24:2 26:12 speak 8:25 9:1 30:16 **Supreme** 16:17 special 14:2 stating 14:7 25:4,15 taxpayer 11:16 statute 14:22 12:23 13:8,22 species 14:5 26:6 **Surely** 16:15 24:13 32:23 34:13 taxpayer's 12:21 surprise 29:11 statutes 23:19.22 specific 24:3 technology 26:2 surprised 8:13 24:9 31:18 35:12,20 tenaciously sustain 29:14,20 statutory 11:19 specifically 14:7 30:17 16:19 22:11 24:10 swath 32:21 stenographer tender 9:12,18 35:4 20:11 28:9 sword 8:7,10,15, 10:16 11:6 12:16 spending 11:22 18 **step** 18:10 13:12 14:9,11,12, 16,19,23,25 15:8, spent 8:5 **system** 18:12,16 **stop** 21:6 9,16,18,22,23,24 19:19 20:2,13 **stakes** 25:21 **strict** 33:12 16:7,13,14,20 26:3,5 30:16 17:23 18:5,21 standard 15:11 strictly 16:9 23:17 25:7 26:15 23:24 26:7 Т stripping 13:9 32:8 **stars** 34:23 term 9:25 10:1 strongly 22:15 **taking** 23:13 **starting** 5:21 7:19 22:1 23:23 31:22 structure 26:8 27:12 31:12 talk 32:13 terms 21:17 22:12 studying 8:5 **state** 2:2 3:9 5:20 talking 32:20,22 testified 14:3 8:2,3 9:22 11:14 33:22 34:4,10,11, **stuff** 36:11,22 14:15,20,23 15:1, 13 35:13 testify 6:16 subject 12:11 5,15 16:1,2,3 tax 2:1 3:9 5:6,13, theory 12:18 14:5 17:3 29:25 17:9,21,24 23:13 22 6:8 9:6,22 24:6,11,13 26:9, thereof 9:17 19:4 submission 10:9,10 11:3,13 13,16,17,19,20 22:7 35:18,20 36:2

Index: thesis..young

thesis 10:16 unconditionally viewed 13:3 Υ 36:20 18:7 24:24 violate 12:13 unconstitutional thing 15:3 19:10 Yadao 3:10 4:13 23:15 33:1,25 12:8 5:22,24 7:16 things 12:15 13:3 unconstitutionali violated 24:14 27:13 28:8,13,16 18:10 32:22 ty 30:16,17 violating 24:11 year 9:6 27:18 thought 25:9 understanding 25:24 28:22 30:4 35:24 9:10 24:19 time 5:8 19:15 violation 12:2 years 8:5 30:6,7 27:7,9 31:6,7 30:18 understood 35:25 34:23 36:22 36:21,22 vote 10:25 13:8, young 36:19 timely 29:16 unequivocally 10,11,20 22:24 times 21:16 voted 10:23 unfortunate Title 9:13 19:25 25:19 W today 15:9 25:9 unit 24:4 26:1 29:4 31:22 W-2 27:25 **United** 9:11,13 **Today's** 5:7,9 10:5,15 11:10,24 wage 27:18,25 touched 10:6 12:20,23 14:6,8 29:7 15:7 16:25 17:25 **tracked** 18:5,6 walk 20:14 18:16,25 20:5,9 traditional 12:14 21:4,13,20 22:6,9, wanted 7:6 36:8 12,16 trans 18:15 Washington 21:5 Unites 10:4 **TRANSCRIPT** Wednesday 2:19 2:16 unknown 24:25 5:1,7 transfer 12:13 unlawful 11:16 welfare 11:24 21:2 transmuttered well-settled 8:8 unnecessary 8:4 27:19 28:3 treasury 16:5 unreported 27:20 whichever 26:9 20:9,15 21:4 35:1 unwilling 18:1 willful 29:19 treaties 14:14 upheld 30:18,19 witnesses 6:16 trigger 9:8 23:11 **USC** 19:20 word 16:23 24:2,3 triggers 10:2 work 24:20 26:19 ٧ trouble 22:2 world 34:3 turn 23:15 26:25 valid 8:17 10:3 writes 11:13 27:10 30:24 36:9,15 written 5:14 18:14 twisting 21:8 validity 19:21 36:19 type 29:7 version 18:13 wrong 9:5 victim 25:19 wrote 35:6,8 U **Vierra** 11:12 ultimate 8:16 view 18:13