## BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF	THE APPEAL OF	)
		)
OLYMPUS AMERICA,	INC.,	) OTA NO. 19125560
		)
	APPELLANT.	)
		)

**CERTIFIED COPY** 

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2022

Reported by:

SARAH M. TUMAN, RPR CSR No. 14463

Job No.: 38486 OTA(A)

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF )
6	OLYMPUS AMERICA, INC., ) OTA NO. 19125560
7	APPELLANT. )
8	)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
16	400 R Street, Sacramento, California,
17	commencing at 9:43 a.m. and concluding
18	at 11:28 a.m. on Tuesday, September 20, 2022,
19	reported by Sarah M. Tuman, RPR, CSR No. 14463,
20	a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for
21	the State of California.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
3	Panel Lead:	ALJ JOSH LAMBERT
4		
5	Panel Members:	ALJ MICHAEL GEARY ALJ SHERIENE RIDENOUR
6		
7	For the Appellant:	AMY SILVERSTEIN, ESQ.
8	- 01 01 01 01 1 1 P P 01 1 01 1 0 1 0 1 0	R. TOBIN
9		
10	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND FEE
11		ADMINISTRATION
12		KEVIN SMITH SCOTT CLAREMON
13		JASON PARKER
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX	
2		
3	EXHIBITS	
4	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-12 were received at page	e 6)
5	(Department's Exhibits A-E were received at page	e 6)
6		
7		
8	PRESENTATION	
9		PAGE
10	BY MS. SILVERSTEIN	7
11	BY MR. SMITH	47
12		
13	APPELLANT'S WITNESS: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT	DECDOCC
14	WITNESS: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT  ROBERT TOBIN 11 29 46	RECROSS
15	ROBERT TOBIN II 29 40	
16		
17		
18	CLOSING ARGUMENT	
19		PAGE
20	BY MS. SILVERSTEIN	63
21	(Further) By MS. SILVERSTEIN	79
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	Sacramento, California; Tuesday, September 20, 2022
2	9:43 a.m.
3	000
4	JUDGE LAMBERT: We are now on the record in the
5	Office of Tax Appeal's oral hearing for the Appeal of
6	Olympus America, Inc., Case Number 19125560.
7	The date is September 20, 2022, and the time is
8	9:44 a.m. My name is Josh Lambert, and I'm the lead
9	administrative law judge for the purposes of conducting
10	this hearing. And my co-panelists today are Judge
11	Sheriene Ridenour and Judge Michael Geary.
12	CDTFA, could you please introduce yourselves for
13	the record?
14	MR. SMITH: My name is Kevin Smith from the CDTFA
15	Legal Department.
16	MR. CLAREMON: Scott Claremon.
17	MR. PARKER: And Jason Parker.
18	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you for attending.
19	And representatives representatives for
20	Appellant, could you please introduce yourselves as well?
21	MS. SILVERSTEIN: My name is Amy Silverstein, and
22	I'm representing Olympus today.
23	MR. TOBIN: And I'm Bob Tobin from Olympus.
24	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you.
25	And also, Mr. Tobin, when you you speak, if

1 you could maybe get a little closer. 2 MR. TOBIN: Speak louder? 3 JUDGE LAMBERT: Just so it picks up on the 4 YouTube livestream. 5 As agreed to at the prehearing conference, the issues are whether parts used to repair a non-California 6 7 customer's equipment pursuant to an optional maintenance contract at a repair facility in California are exempt 8 9 from use tax under R&TC Section 6009.1; whether Appellant 10 is entitled to relief from tax penalties and interests pursuant to R&TC Section 6596; and whether Appellant is 11 12 liable for the negligence penalty. 13 FTB [sic] provides Exhibits A through E; 14 Appellant provides Exhibits 1 through 12. There are no 15 objections to the evidence, and it is now in the record. (Appellant's Exhibit Nos. 1-12 were received in 16 17 evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 18 (Department's Exhibits A-E were received in 19 evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 20 JUDGE LAMBERT: And just as we discussed before, 21 CDTFA submitted a statement of undisputed facts. 22 And, Ms. Silverstein, could you just confirm on 23 the record that you don't dispute those facts? 2.4 MS. SILVERSTEIN: We do not dispute those facts. 25 JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you.

1	And, Mr. Tobin, you'll be testifying; is that
2	correct? As a witness?
3	MR. TOBIN: Yes.
4	JUDGE LAMBERT: So before Ms. Silverstein's
5	presentation, I can swear in Mr. Tobin, and you can have
6	45 minutes to explain your position.
7	So I could swear you in right now, if you could
8	please raise your right hand?
9	
LO	ROBERT TOBIN,
11	called as a witness on behalf of the Appellant, having
L2	first been duly sworn by the Administrative Law Judge, was
13	examined and testified as follows:
L4	
15	MR. TOBIN: Yes.
L6	JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thanks.
L7	And, Ms. Silverstein, if you're ready to proceed,
18	you can have 45 minutes for your presentation with his
L9	testimony. And you can proceed now. Thank you.
20	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. Great. Thank you very
21	much.
22	
23	PRESENTATION
24	MS. SILVERSTEIN: And thank you all for your time
25	today.

As you know, I'm Amy Silverstein. I'm representing Olympus today. This case involves repair parts used at an Olympus repair facility in San Jose, California.

2.4

In three prior audits the State Board taxed parts used to repair the equipment of California customers but did not -- did not and never did tax the parts used to repair equipment of out-of-state customers.

And we agree that tax was -- is proper on the repair parts for the in-state customers. Although there was no change in facts at all, the Board abruptly changed its position and assessed use tax on the repair parts for the out-of-state customers' equipment.

What is even more surprising is that there is a statute directly on point, which excludes these repair parts for out-of-state from use tax. The facts are very simple:

The customer ships its equipment from out-of-state to the repair facility in California.

Olympus removes the broken part, replaces it with a new part that's exactly the same, and then sends the equipment back to the customer out-of-state for use in the customer's medical practice out-of-state.

The customer isn't charged for the repair because it had purchased an optional maintenance contract when it

purchased equipment.

2.4

Now, CDTFA argues that these repair parts for the out-of-state customers' equipment is subject to use tax.

This is incorrect because Revenue and Tax Code
Section 6009.1 says there's no use, and so there's no tax.
We reproduced the statute on the poster over here.

It says that use "does not include exercising any right over tangible personal property for the purpose of being attached to or incorporated into other tangible personal property to be transported outside the state and thereafter used solely outside of the state."

This is exactly what Olympus does when it repairs an out-of-state customer's equipment. It exercises a right over the repair parts for the purpose of incorporating them into the customer's equipment to be transported outside of the state and thereafter used solely outside of the state.

Given the exclusion statute directly on point, we believe this is a very simple case. And we've struggled to understand why it's still going on.

Now, CDTFA cites authorities and makes argument regarding why the repair parts are taxable. But that's not what this case is about.

Items can be taxable in the first instance. But if an exemption or exclusion applies, then no tax is due.

And CDTFA has not and cannot explain why the exclusion statute does not apply.

2.4

Specifically, CDTFA relies on the regulation, but of course, a statute always wins out over a regulation.

The regulation addresses optional maintenance contracts. And it says that, if repair work is performed under a maintenance -- optional maintenance contract, the repairer is regarded as the consumer of the parts that are furnished.

It does not say that the parts are taxable; it says the repairer is regarded as the consumer of the parts.

So under that regulation, if there was tax due, the tax would be a use tax because the repairer in this case, Olympus, is regarded as the consumer of the parts.

And this is why the parts for the equipment repaired for in-state customers is taxable. There's no exclusion; so use tax applies.

But for an out-of-state customer, 6009.1 states expressly that the repair is not a use. And the statute necessarily prevails over the statute [sic]. So use tax does not apply to the repair parts used for the out-of-state customer's equipment.

Okay. I'm going to ask Mr. Tobin to testify now, unless your Honors have any questions.

1	JUDGE LAMBERT: He can testify now. We we'll
2	save our questions until after you finish your
3	presentation. Thanks.
4	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.
5	
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MS. SILVERSTEIN:
8	Q Okay. Mr. Tobin, I was going to ask you to state
9	your name, but we can skip that.
10	A Bob Tobin.
11	Q What is your educational background?
12	A I have a bachelor's in business administration
13	from Hofstra University with a concentration in public
14	accounting.
15	Q Do you work for the Taxpayer?
16	A I do.
17	Q How long have you worked there?
18	A 25 years.
19	Q What is your current position?
20	A Vice president of tax, corporate insurance, and
21	transfer pricing.
22	Q Do your duties include California sales and use
23	tax compliance?
24	A They do.
25	Q As a result of those duties, are you familiar

1 with Olympus's medical equipment and repair business and 2 qualified to testify about it today? 3 Α Tam. 4 What medical equipment does Olympus sell? 0 5 Primarily -- well, Olympus, worldwide, has, like, Α 70 percent of the -- the market for endoscopes -- like, 6 colonoscopes used in colonoscopies -- which is -- that --7 that's what's the diagram you see --8 9 (Reporter admonition) 10 THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah. So the -- the medical -so it's -- primarily, it's medical equipment. That's 11 12 what's being repaired in San Jose. 13 The endoscope -- there's a variety of 14 endoscopes that -- that are made for -- they're tailored 15 to different medical procedures. The colonoscopies -- which I believe that's the 16 17 scope on the -- the screen right now is a colonoscope --18 that the tube you see hanging down that -- that's a 19 flexible tube that can be steered through the body with 20 the controls on the -- on the top control here.

But there's also -- we call that -- that's a tower of equipment that has different -- so that -- so that the tube that's inserted into the body has a number of smaller tubes inside it that pass through to -- like, it finds a polyp, it can snare it, you -- you put a snare

21

22

23

2.4

25

in there, and you can snare, and you can pull it out so you can -- that's the benefit of the procedure is you can fix the problem at the same time that you're diagnosing the problem.

So there's a number of pieces of equipment that are used with it. There's a light source because you -- you're shining light through one of the tubes.

There's an air channel for -- because you blow up -- because they pump air into the intestines. So it kind of expands it to make it easier to, you know -- to see polyps. Because it's all a visual thing.

So those -- those -- as you can see, there's a handful of pieces of equipment -- you know, light source, air, water -- so any of those pieces would be -- or all those pieces are -- are designed and manufactured by Olympus Japan.

So when we repair it, we're just buying replacement parts from Japan and inserting them into the -- during the process.

## BY MS. SILVERSTEIN:

2.4

Q So is this image on the screen right now representative of all the equipment that Olympus repairs at the San Jose facility?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And do you want to scroll to the next

1 | slide.

2.4

Can you explain what this is?

A So -- right. So there's a number of parts. You can see there's a number of parts.

A lot of these, like, the -- the diagrams that we're going to follow after that schedule are pretty much a diagram of this top-right control unit.

So what we did is we just -- on -- on these slides -- we identified some key parts that are part of the endoscope.

We put part numbers on there so you can see that they actually tie back to what's being taxed in the audit. And so we gave two different types of scopes. I think they're both colonoscopes.

So yeah. So -- so what -- typically what'd happen is we would replace -- so one of the -- so we have a video of -- of repairs. And if you look at the -- you see that tube on the bottom right, that's the tube that's inserted in the body.

One of the repairs that we're going to show you is whenever there's, you know, a hole -- a breach in that plastic, then they have to cut it off and they have to replace it. It's called a "bending cover."

So that's -- they say that that's the most common repair is replacing the bending cover.

So typically, you know, a customer will see that there's a problem with the scope during the procedure, and so they'll call the service center to, you know, lodge a complaint. Because I think they need approval to just send it to San Jose for repair.

So once they get the approval, they send it in.

And during that process, we determine what the problem is and determine what the cost is.

If it's part of a -- an optional maintenance contract, it's not something we're going to charge the customer. We just, you know, keep track of the cost, you know, for our records.

Q So just to --

2.4

A Did I go off point there for a moment rambling?

MS. SILVERSTEIN: Well, it's okay.

Just -- just to be clear -- so this is Exhibit 2, your Honors. And the reason we're showing this to you is just so you can get an image in your mind of the type of products that are repaired at the facility and also, you know, the various parts that CDTFA, you know, ended up imposing use tax on.

And we are going to show you a video of the actual repair process. But this is just to kind of give you the context.

THE WITNESS: So it does -- so as you page

1	through, this this is just showing the the shaft and
2	then the number of tubes that are in, you know, kind of
3	that is comprised in this the product.
4	BY MS. SILVERSTEIN:
5	Q So does Olympus sell optional maintenance
6	contracts for repairs of customer equipment?
7	A We do.
8	Q And where does Olympus get the repair parts it
9	uses to perform the optional maintenance contracts?
10	A From Olympus Japan.
11	Q And are the repair parts the same parts that are
12	used to manufacture the products initially?
13	A They are.
14	Q Where does Olympus take title to the repair
15	parts?
16	A When they're shipped from Japan.
17	Q So is it correct, then, that no tax sales tax
18	was paid when Olympus purchased the parts from Japan?
19	A Correct.
20	Q Okay. And can you tell us a little bit about the
21	repair facility the repair facility in San Jose when
22	it was established, its size, and so forth?
23	A It was established in 1979. So Ringwood Avenue,
24	but it was recently moved.
25	There's about 666 people working there. And the

1 payroll is about \$43 million. But annual payroll it's 2 about \$43 million. So it's a sizable --3 JUDGE LAMBERT: Mr. -- Mr. Tobin, please make 4 sure you speak a little -- maybe a little louder or closer 5 to the microphone so we can hear you. Thanks. THE WITNESS: Oh. And slower? 6 7 JUDGE LAMBERT: I think, when you turn your head, it doesn't -- the microphone doesn't pick it up as much. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Okay. 10 JUDGE LAMBERT: So I think you kind of have to speak into the microphone even though you may be talking 11 to Ms. Silverstein. 12 13 THE WITNESS: So the facility is located in San 14 It has about 666 employees as of now, today. Jose. 15 \$43 million in payroll -- annual payroll. We've been there since 1979. We recently moved a -- a couple of 16 miles away but still within San Jose. 17 BY MS. SILVERSTEIN: 18 19 At this facility, does Olympus repair equipment 0 20 of both California customers and out-of-state customers? 21 Α Yes. 22 Approximately what percent of the repairs are for 0 23 California versus non-California customers? 2.4 It's -- roughly 8 percent of the business is Α

California.

25

1 Okay. And I think you already really described 0 2 what happens when a customer with an optional maintenance 3 contract needs their equipment repaired. 4 Want to go over that quickly, again? 5 I -- I just want to make sure. Was there -- I Α said it was 8 -- 8 percent. Was there -- did you --6 7 JUDGE GEARY: Did you say 8 percent? THE WITNESS: 8 8. 9 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. Thank you. 10 MS. SILVERSTEIN: 8 percent California. 8 percent California. Sorry. 11 THE WITNESS: 12 BY MS. SILVERSTEIN: 13 Just, at a high level, describe what happens when 0 14 an -- a customer with an optional maintenance contract 15 needs their equipment repaired. All right. So they've got -- they identify that 16 there's a problem. So it's usually -- it could be a video 17 18 The -- the -- so there's some problem with the 19 scope, and they want to return it. So we -- so they -- I 20 think they need authorization. 21 So they have to call our customer service line 22 who will give them, like, an approval number. We ship it 23 Then it goes into a process where they're -- try to

And then, once they determine what that is, they,

figure out what is the problem with the scope.

2.4

25

you know, disassemble the scope to remove the defective part. And then they replace it with a new part. It's -- that we purchased from Japan.

Then they'll do testing. And then, once it's -to see if there's anything else wrong as well. And if -once it's ready to go, then they just package it back up
and ship it back to the customer.

And I think their target is to get it back within 48 hours. So -- well, once we receive it. So that's another indication it's a pretty transitory presence. It just comes here. We fix it. It goes back.

Because that -- that -- the colonoscopy business is -- is, in a sense, it kind -- it almost -- look at -- some of the major places will look like a, you know -- a factory that they just move from, you know -- from bed to bed.

You do have to obviously have to sterilize it in between procedures.

But if they're -- if they don't have that -- one of the scopes, that kind of delays -- that sets them back. So that's why we try to get back to them as soon as possible.

Q If an out-of-state customer sends its equipment to San Jose for a repair, will it always be shipped back to the customer out-of-state after the repair?

1	A Yes.
2	Q And how do you know that?
3	A It's well, because the when when if
4	you say, like, the Cleveland Clinic will send in a
5	defective scope so it was being used in, you know,
6	Cleveland, Ohio. They ship it to us. We fix it. Two
7	days later we ship it back. It's going back to Cleveland
8	Clinic in Ohio so, you know, they're they're using
9	it in their business.
10	Q Does Olympus charge these customers for the
11	repair pursuant to their optional maintenance contract?
12	A No, not for the repair.
13	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. And we're going to show
14	the video now. We have two, actually two different
15	pieces that are being repaired.
16	They're short.
17	(Video played)
18	BY MS. SILVERSTEIN:
19	Q So basically, what you're seeing there is the
20	replacement of that cover on the long piece and then also
21	that kind of rounded plastic piece. They take it out;
22	they put a new one in.
23	Do you have any other comments about that?
24	A No.
25	Q Okay. Do you want to share the next video?

1 Α That's what --2 0 Oh. 3 -- I'm getting concerned about -- going to the А next video. 4 5 0 Oh. (Video played) 6 7 BY MS. SILVERSTEIN: Are you familiar with Olympus's sales and use tax 8 Q treatment of the repair parts at the repair facility in 9 10 San Jose? 11 Α Yes. 12 Has Olympus paid tax on the repair parts for 0 13 repairing equipment of customers outside of California? 14 Α No. 15 And why is that? 0 16 Because 6009.1 excludes it. Α 17 Okay. Q 18 Α The tax and use. 19 And has Olympus paid use tax on the repair for Q 20 repairing equipment of California customers? 21 Α Yes. And why is that? 22 0 23 Exclusion doesn't apply to something that stays Α within the state. 2.4 25 Okay. And does Olympus use any consumables, such 0

1 as solvents, in their repair process? 2. Α Yes. Does Olympus pay sales and use tax on those 3 4 consumables used in the repair process? 5 Α Yes. Okay. And why is that? 6 0 7 Because they're actually consumed. There's no --Α there's no exclusion for -- for those consumables. 8 9 Q Okay. Thank you. 10 So I understand that you've done a lot of work to 11 find and understand the legislative history of Rev. and 12 Tax Code 6009.1. 13 Can you please describe how you got the "leg. 14 history" and what you learned about the purpose of the 15 statute? When -- when the issue first was raised, 16 Α 17 it didn't take long before they figured out 6009.1 should 18 exclude it. And so -- but the auditor didn't agree. 19 So I was -- I wanted to do more research on it. 20 So I, at the suggestion of an adviser who said, "Well, why 21 don't you contact -- why don't you get the legislative history?" 22 23 So I called this -- this company, Legislative 24 Intent, LLC, who's -- that's what they do is they go and 25 they'll -- they'll do the research.

So that's when I learned that the, you know -the legislation for 6009.1 happened in 1943. And
fortunately, there's a few memos and letters going back
and forth between Board of Equalization and the Governor's
Office and also an attorney there at the time.

They were kind of explaining that -- that it was -- apparently this company called the Pullman Company, which is a train -- it's -- they had a business where they would run sleeper cars that were attached to rail -- to -- to trains that would go across country.

And so, you know, they -- because of the number of railroads throughout the country, they would ship their, you know, defective sleeper car to California -- there was a repair shop in Richmond -- and they would do the same, where they would replace parts and ship it back out-of-state.

And so, apparently, Pullman must have complained and raised -- you know, raised the issue. And so there was a -- a move or a push to exclude from tax any parts that were installed in California -- if it was only going to be a transitory presence in California and shipped out-of-state, they were going to exclude it.

And the -- and the sole reason is because

they wanted -- they thought that having this tax would -would discourage companies from setting up repair

operations in California.

That's the whole reason for the exclusion. It's nothing about the part itself. It's -- it's the fact that what's the situation you're using it in? Well, it's -- it's a transitory presence and it gets shipped out and it's used outside the state.

And so if you think about -- there was a number of different railroads. So if they were repairing, you know, the Reading Railroad's sleeper car, they know it's not coming into California. That's not their territory.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, Redding Railroad, New York Railroad. There was a number of railroads. They're not going to go back. They don't, you know, have a business operating in California.

So they agreed. And even at the time, the Board of Equalization acknowledged, well, this is going to lower the tax base, but everybody's telling us -- I'm paraphrasing -- everybody's telling us that if you, you know, pass this exclusion, then at least you're not going to penalize these companies for repairing, you know, out-of-state equipment here in the state.

And it passed. And -- and that's -- that's the whole purpose. That's what we're doing. That's why we -- we reprinted the, you know -- the statute. Because it seems clear that, you know, we're not trying to -- I'm not

trying to fit our facts into the law or the law into our facts.

2.

2.4

It's just that's -- it's -- it's kind of clear from the language. And -- and the language itself is clear enough.

But -- and I took that extra step to go see -- all right. Well, where'd it come from? And is that -- is that consistent with, you know, our business? And it is consistent.

This, you know -- the issue -- this issue was raised in, say -- in 2014 or so. And I -- when I would, you know, do research and I wanted to get, you know, any research -- any fact about it -- I -- because I just wanted to know, am I missing something?

So when you Google it and you spend a lot of, you know, time with that, I found that there's a -- a library in Chicago that actually has hundreds of boxes of Pullman Company documents.

So after a few months of thinking about it, then I told my boss that I really have to go. I really have to go to Chicago. So I went there with the staff. And we spent two days, you know, requesting boxes from this library.

I -- I don't know why they kept -- well -- so the Pullman Company's headquarters was in downtown Chicago.

And so, when the company went out of business and they were -- so instead of throwing out the records, apparently they asked the library, "Do you want a bunch of Pullman records?"

2.4

And it turns out, just from the research I've done over years, railroads are really, you know -- people find it very interesting. So I think that that's part of the reason why -- but anyway --

So we went there -- so what one of -- it wasn't hugely productive. But I did learn like, you know, that they do lease -- their business was leasing the sleeper car to the railroads. So there's a number of lease agreements dating back to the 1800's.

I mean, the one for the Lehigh Valley Railroad, which is where I'm from, was dated, I think, 1873. So it showed that, you know, that's -- that's what their business was. It was just the -- the sleeper business.

They would lease the cars to the railroads. They would staff the cars with porters and, you know, housekeepers, chefs. It was really, you know, it's a luxury kind of a business. So --

Q So just to be clear, the -- you referenced some letters and memos between the State Board and the Governor.

Are those the same letters and memos that are

1 exhibits in this case? 2. Α Yes. 3 Okay. So the Judges have them? 0 4 Α Yes. 5 MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. Thank you. 6 So I just want to summarize. That was basically the conclusion of our 6009.1 argument. Just to be very 7 clear -- we've said it before -- the statute describes 8 9 exactly what Olympus does at its repair facility when it 10 repairs out-of-state equipment. 11 It exercises a right over the repair parts for the purpose of incorporating them into the customer's 12 13 equipment to be transported outside of the state and, 14 thereafter, used solely outside of the state. 15 As you heard, the express purpose for the, 16 legislation for the statute was to encourage companies to have repair facilities in California. 17 18 We aren't trying to fit the statute that was 19 written for a different purpose into our case. It was 20 written for this purpose. It was written for repairs. 21 CDTFA hasn't provided any coherent reason why the 22 exclusion statute doesn't apply. And the panel should 23 grant Olympus's appeal. 2.4 I do have some brief things to say about the

relief provision and the penalty.

25

1	Would it be possible to save that until the end?
2	JUDGE LAMBERT: Yeah, you can. You have about
3	18 minutes left in your 45 minutes. So if you want to,
4	like, use any time left, we could add it to the end.
5	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. That would be great.
6	Yeah. Because I really want to focus on the statute.
7	Because we think that should resolve the case and you
8	shouldn't have to reach the other issues.
9	JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay.
10	And CDTFA Mr. Smith, you'd probably have the
11	opportunity to respond after that, if if we're moving
12	it as well to the end.
13	So does that conclude your presentation at this
14	time?
15	MS. SILVERSTEIN: It does.
16	JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you.
17	MR. SMITH: Excuse me. Do do we have the
18	opportunity to ask the witness questions?
19	JUDGE LAMBERT: Yeah. You will have the
20	opportunity.
21	MR. SMITH: Thank you.
22	JUDGE LAMBERT: Let me just clarify, first, that
23	on the testimony, Mr. Tobin appreciate the statements
24	on the leg. history. We wouldn't consider it to be
25	testimony, per se. But, you know, we'll take it into

1	consideration when making a determination.
2	So, CDTFA Mr. Smith, you can ask Mr. Tobin
3	questions if you want.
4	MR. SMITH: Thank you. I just have two
5	questions.
6	
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. SMITH:
9	Q My first question is does Olympus sell repair
10	parts stored in the San Jose facility?
11	A Sell parts to another oh. Sorry.
12	Q Yeah. To, like, a just a hospital I guess,
13	one of your customers do they sell parts?
14	A It's if there's not an optional maintenance
15	contract oh. Sorry.
16	If there's not an optional maintenance contract,
17	then we would bill yeah. We would bill the customer
18	for parts and labor, combined.
19	Q Okay. And my second question is does Olympus use
20	repair parts stored in it's San Jose inventory pursuant to
21	mandatory maintenance contracts?
22	A We use the parts to fix warranty products,
23	which yeah. I think it would consider mandatory
24	maintenance contracts.
25	Q Some of those are included in the sale? They're

not the optional type? 1 2 Α Say that again. Some of those warranties are warranties 3 0 4 that are included with the sale. That -- that's not 5 optional to the customer? It's just included 6 automatically; right? 7 Α Right. 8 MR. SMITH: Okay. Okay. Thank you. 9 JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you. Thank you. 10 Judge Geary, did you have any questions? 11 JUDGE GEARY: Yes, I do. Thank you. Mr. Tobin, I -- I think you testified that the --12 13 the company that you work for has never paid use tax in 14 connection with the parts used to repair the machinery for 15 out-of-state customers; is that correct? 16 THE WITNESS: Right. 17 JUDGE GEARY: So what period of time are we 18 talking about? The statute -- I think somebody referred 19 to 6009.1 as having been first put on the books in '40 --20 THE WITNESS: 1943. 21 JUDGE GEARY: '43. 22 So for as long as you've been with the company, 23 I'm assuming Olympus has not paid tax on parts that were 2.4 used to repair machines for out-of-state customers? 25 THE WITNESS: Correct.

JUDGE GEARY: And is it -- is it your testimony that the original decision to not pay tax was related to this analysis based on section 6009.1?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. So, I mean, the audit -- the prior audits never taxed -- like, when they -- they looked at the -- the optional maintenance contracts. It was always part of the assessment.

But they -- if you look at the records -- what they did -- they didn't -- they were only focused on California contracts -- customers.

JUDGE GEARY: Your -- your response is an indication to me of what the -- what CDTFA was doing.

But is it your testimony that your company's decision to not pay tax on those parts was based upon your company's analysis of the Statute 6009.1?

THE WITNESS: Right. Right.

JUDGE GEARY: Okay. Initially, when you were giving your testimony -- before you showed the -- the videos today -- I had this vision of these people having to pack up this tower-worth of equipment and send it back. And I -- it boggled my mind that you could do that and get it back in 48 hours.

But having seen the videos, it appears that parts of the tower or related parts of the equipment were being sent to you for repairs.

1 Is that a fair --2 THE WITNESS: Right. 3 -- characterization? JUDGE GEARY: 4 THE WITNESS: Right. Because, as you said, it's 5 a bit of an effort to move the whole tower around. it's -- generally, they'll -- they'll send in the 6 7 defective part. 8 And that might be part of the consulting when 9 they call with the service center as far as what they 10 should be sending back. So --11 JUDGE GEARY: That was going to be my next 12 question. 13 How does the customer know what part to send back? 14 15 THE WITNESS: I would just -- I would say that it 16 was probably -- I -- I -- what -- what it probably was --17 that's the reason why they asked them to call the 18 service -- the customer service center, first, before 19 you -- before you do anything as far -- well, before you 20 ship anything, you're supposed to get authority to ship 21 it. 22 JUDGE GEARY: So it's your understanding that 23 somebody at Olympus's customer service center walks 24 through, perhaps, the symptoms that were being experienced 25 by the customer and, based on that information, makes a

1 recommendation regarding what part or parts to return for 2 repair? Yeah, I think so. 3 THE WITNESS: 4 I mean, I would have to confirm that. 5 think that the whole -- that's part of the purpose where you have to do that very first step -- call us to --6 7 before you ship anything back, call us. The -- the -- the videos describe 8 JUDGE GEARY: 9 the process of repairing two different parts. 10 Would it be fair to assume that -- that, 11 regardless of the part that is returned for repair, the 12 process is basically the same? 13 They complete an on-site diagnosis of the 14 They do the repair. They test the part to make problem. 15 sure that it's working the way that it is supposed to. 16 And then they return it to the customer? 17 THE WITNESS: That's right. 18 JUDGE GEARY: And I believe you answered a 19 question affirmatively that it's always the same part 20 that's returned to the customer -- that is, whatever part 21 is sent to Olympus for repair, Olympus always repairs that 22 part and returns the same one to the customer. 23 Is that the way it works? 2.4 THE WITNESS: Yes. As far as I know, yeah. 25 JUDGE GEARY: So there's -- there's no instances

that you're aware where Olympus has stock parts, for
example, that are available to send to a customer in -- in
lieu of returning the exact same part that they sent to
Olympus for repair?

2.4

THE WITNESS: There's a small amount of, like, on site -- because there are field engineers that will travel throughout the country. And they can do certain repairs.

But it's not -- it's not the major repairs that are done here. It's not the major repairs that happen in San Jose.

JUDGE GEARY: There was a question -- a question about consumables.

And I believe your testimony was that Olympus pays tax on all consumables, whether those are used on the repair of an -- of a California customer or an out-of-state customer; is that -- is that correct.

THE WITNESS: That's right.

JUDGE GEARY: Regarding the legislative history research that you undertook with your staff, you -- you've provided some documents that have been admitted as exhibits.

I'm -- were those the only documents that you culled from all the documents you reviewed in the course of your research?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. When you go through the --

1 the legislative history -- might be -- it was pretty 2 lengthy. But a lot of it was just repeated drafts of, you 3 know, markups, cross-out here and there. 4 It's -- what we attached was -- the So yeah. 5 real substance was that -- like, what the key was -- is those memos that kind of explain things. A lot -- much of 6 the dozens of pages of legislative history is -- might 7 8 just be the markup. 9 And also -- not necessarily just for -- that bill 10 may have had other sections in it unrelated to 6009.1. And so that -- so the -- there might be a volume, you 11 know, of pages. But -- but, you know, we only focused on 12 13 the 6009.1-relevant documents. 14 JUDGE GEARY: The company that you hired 15 initially -- you made reference to them -- something about "legislativeintent.com" or something. 16 17 What was that? 18 THE WITNESS: Legislative Intent, LLC. 19 JUDGE GEARY: Did they provide you a report 20 regarding legislative history on this 6009.1? 21 THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's not -- yes. 22 What they -- or that's what -- I thought they

were going to give just purely, you know, here's the bills

and that's it. But they do make comments and say, you

know, "Think about this. Think about that."

23

24

25

They do mention that the bill was presented in the prior congress session in 1942 and said, "So if you don't find what you're looking for in 1943, maybe you can see if there's something in 1942."

2.4

But the information that was helpful was found in -- in the 1943 in a batch of documents.

JUDGE GEARY: The Pullman Company -- I take it -- you -- you mentioned Pullman Company a number of times in your testimony.

Did you understand the Pullman Company to have been a primary mover in -- in connection with getting this legislation passed?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Because they -- they were mentioned specifically in one of the letters saying that, you know -- and it's probably -- might have been a -- it was an attorney. I'm not sure what his connection was -- obviously their representative.

And saying that his letter to the Governor -Governor Warren -- he was saying that -- that the
exclusion that we're talking about here is best, you
know -- the best example of that or a good example of that
is the Pullman business that's fixing their train cars -repairing their train cars in California.

So they did specifically refer to Pullman.

JUDGE GEARY: Was -- was Pullman Company the

owner of the cars that were being sent to California for repair?

2.4

THE WITNESS: The Pullman Company -- there -- there's actually two -- there's at least two legal entities.

So the -- the sleeper car company was called the Pullman Company. And they have -- if you look at their -- there was a tax return in -- in the -- in -- in Newberry, which was a 1926 tax return.

And so it shows that you can see that the sleeper car company only had revenue from a sleeper car business. If you look on their balance sheet, you can see the cars on their balance sheet. There was \$200 million in cars. So it was a sizable fleet, let's say. And also the revenue was sizable -- \$83 million back in 1943.

So it was -- a few of -- this -- again, if you

Google it, you can get other information about it -- there
was another legal entity called something like "The

Pullman Manufacturing and Repair Business" or something.

That's the one that was based out in Richmond in California. That's who was doing the repairs. So when they -- when they did the repairs, it was for the Pullman Company -- for the sleeper car company. Because you can see on the balance sheet they had -- they owned cars.

So it wasn't -- it wasn't the Pullman

1 Manufacturing Car company in California. They -- they did 2 not own the cars. They were just doing the service -- the 3 repair service. 4 JUDGE GEARY: And the person who was lobbying --5 or the entity that was lobbying in favor of the bill that resulted in 6009.1 -- it's your understanding that that 6 7 entity was the one that was doing the repairs in California? 8 9 THE WITNESS: Right. 10 JUDGE GEARY: Or the one that was owning the cars 11 and that were being shipped to California? That was the one in California. 12 THE WITNESS: 13 And in -- in the documents, though, they don't -- they 14 don't -- they'll just say "The Pullman --" they just refer 15 to it as "Pullman." They don't specify whether it's the 16 Pullman Company, the sleeper car business, or Pullman, the repair -- manufacturing and repair business. 17 18 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. Thank you very much. Those 19 were the only questions I had. 20 Thank you, Judge Geary. JUDGE LAMBERT: 21 Judge Ridenour, do you have any questions? 22 JUDGE RIDENOUR: I do not have any questions at 23 this time. 2.4 JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you. 25 I have a couple of questions.

I was just wondering, Mr. Tobin, if -- you were stating that you had informed this position on 6009.1.

And that's the reason for the nonreporting of the -- of the non-California customers.

2.4

And that was -- that position was formed during the time of the previous audits? Or when did you come to that conclusion?

THE WITNESS: So, you know, when the audits were happening, there was a number of, you know, measures they looked at. And so, you know, my staff would work with the auditor to, you know -- on each of these points.

And so, when you look at -- so 6009.1 became an issue once the current audit started questioning the taxability of those parts.

And I was like, "Well, you never taxed them in the past; so why are you taxing them now?"

And so -- yeah. So it's that point when -- it doesn't take long. Because I, you know -- when I go back and I see the e-mails during that time, it was a pretty short turnaround to figure out, yeah, 6009.1 excludes the parts from tax.

So as far as, like, this conscious decision that you're asking -- like, I started working there in 1996.

And it -- and it was -- was, you know, inherited -- the whole, you know, Tax Department and anything -- any issues

associated with it.

2.4

And so that -- the parts were not really a major issue at all to us when you're only taxing California parts.

As soon as you tax all parts, then there's about ten times more tax because our business in California is only eight percent of the whole business. So then he wanted to tax a hundred percent.

Then it became a material issue. I was like, "Why -- why now?"

And then -- so when you look at it, then I'd see 6009.1. And so I even told the auditor, you know, "This would seem to exclude it. I'll -- I'll give you a memo explaining it."

And he said, "Well, I'll read it. But it's not going to change my mind," which -- that's true. He didn't change his mind.

But it seemed clear from there. And so, you know, we've been led down a couple of paths over the years as far as what their position is.

But again, as Amy said, it's not -- they'll refer to 1546. And we don't dispute that. Because if you look at 1546(b)(3)(c), it says "optional maintenance contracts." Yes. That's -- that's what we sell. So that's not the issue.

1 The issue is that they're not taking the next 2 step to figure out, "Well what's -- is there anything 3 excluded?" 4 And that's -- that's pretty much the whole 5 point -- is they're not looking at 6009.1. 6 JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Tobin. 7 So it seems like you were saying you started looking at 6009.1 during the current audit. 8 So was it discussed -- this issue -- CDTFA -- in 9 10 the previous audits? And if it wasn't based on 6009.1, 11 what was the basis for the nonreporting of the tax on that -- non-California customers. 12 THE WITNESS: Well, again, they -- this, 13 14 historically -- because the -- the auditors would audit. 15 And they only taxed the -- so, again, if you're looking for the conscious decision saying, "Oh. This is -- we've 16 17 done this amount, " no. 18 I was like -- when I got there, this is, I mean, 19 ongoing. They -- they -- they were audited -- Olympus was 20 audited for years. 21 And so, when you look at, you know -- that parts 22 issue was tiny in the overall scheme of things. When you 23 look at the -- the measure -- and the measure of tax --24 for parts in those three audits were between \$200,000 and

\$300,000. And that's it for the entire audit period.

25

1 So if you multiply that by the tax rate, it's --2 it's really not terribly material. And so that didn't -- there was other issues --3 4 "Well, did you get the resale tickets?" -- because we had 5 a -- a camera business at the time. There's a lot -- almost every other measure of 6 7 tax was more material than the parts. So, no, it didn't 8 get the focus. 9 It's just that, in the current audit, when he's 10 expanded it to include all parts. Oh. And why -- so then I said, "Were we wrong?" 11 12 Why -- why, you know -- "Why weren't we paying tax on all of this?" 13 14 And then, when you look at it, you say, "Oh. 15 Well, I imagine it's 6009.1." Because that's what it 16 says -- is that when you're repairing out-of-state 17 customers' property, it's -- it's excluded from use. 18 JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, 19 Mr. Tobin. 20 And I think I just have one question for Ms. Silverstein. 21 In the briefing it goes into this issue of, 22 23 like -- of stating that 1620 is an interpretive regulation 2.4 of 6009.1 -- if you recall in your briefing. 25 MS. SILVERSTEIN: Yeah.

1 And also, I -- I was wondering JUDGE LAMBERT: 2 what the -- what the basis for saying it's an interpretive regulation is. And are you saying that 1546 would be as 3 4 well? 5 And does 1620 -- is that more relevant to 6009.1 than 1546? 6 7 It sounds like you were saying that -- because 1620(b)(9) is an interpretive regulation interpreting 8 9 6009.1, that is more applicable? 10 MS. SILVERSTEIN: Well, yeah. So 1620, if you 11 look at the language -- if you look at -- well, it's 12 Subdivision 9. I think it's -- so what did we --13 JUDGE GEARY: It's (b)(9), according to the exhibit. 14 15 MS. SILVERSTEIN: Yeah, (b)(9). The easiest way to find it -- I don't know if you 16 17 have the Req. in front of you. We didn't actually 18 reproduce the language -- but if you -- you go up from the 19 bottom of the Reg., (b)(9) says -- it -- it basically 20 parrots that Stat. 6009.1. There are a few words that are 21 different. 22 It says, "Storage and use do not include the 23 keeping, retaining, or exercising any reg. or power over 24 property for the purpose of subsequently transporting it

outside the state for use thereafter solely outside the

25

state or for the purpose of being processed, fabricated, or manufactured into, attached to, or incorporated into other property to be transported outside the state and, thereafter, used solely outside the state."

So, yes, your Honor. It is our position that 1620 is an interpretive reg. of 6009.1. It does more than that, but part of it is interpretive of -- of the statute.

And then if you look at the examples, we -- that's what we reproduced on -- on the poster.

One talks about an engine installed in an aircraft which is flown out of the state for use, thereafter, solely outside the state. And that qualifies for the exclusion.

Basically, similar to what Olympus does -inserting a new part into the endoscope -- the piece of
the endoscope -- and then sending it outside of the state
for use outside of the state.

And then, two, also an engine installed in a truck which is transported by rail or air directly out of the state for use thereafter solely outside the state qualifies for the exclusion.

So again, the engine's installed in the truck. It goes out of state. It's used out of state. It's excluded under 6009.1, similar to the repair part in this case.

1 With regard to the other regulation, that's not 2 an interpretive regulation of 6009.1 -- the -- the one 3 about the -- the maintenance contract. 4 That just specifically applies to -- I mean, it 5 has other purposes, but the provision that you're asking about, you know, addresses optional maintenance contracts 6 7 and how the parts used in those, you know -- who's going to be taxable, basically, under different scenarios if 8 9 there's a tax. 10 So it's relevant here. But it's not -- it -- it doesn't -- it -- it doesn't determine the outcome of this 11 12 proceeding. 13 And you know, it tells you that if there's a tax, 14 it would be a use tax. But then you have to look at 6009, 15 which is, you know, a statute that would, in any event, be 16 more authoritative then the req. 17 But 6009 says, under the circumstances, that the 18 part is not -- it's not used, and so there's no tax. 19 Does that answer your question? 20 JUDGE LAMBERT: Yes, Ms. Silverstein. Thank you 21 very much. 22 MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. 23 JUDGE LAMBERT: It's appreciated. 2.4 And now, I believe, we can turn to Mr. Smith.

May --

MS. SILVERSTEIN:

25

-	T
1	JUDGE LAMBERT: Oh. Sorry.
2	MS. SILVERSTEIN: I just want to clarify one
3	piece of the testimony, if that's possible.
4	JUDGE LAMBERT: Sure.
5	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay.
6	
7	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MS. SILVERSTEIN:
9	Q Mr. Tobin, the you testified that the results
10	of these three audits well, let's take the first one
11	was that no use tax was imposed on the repair parts for
12	the out-of-state customers' equipment; is that correct?
13	A Right. Yes.
14	Q And when that after you that audit was
15	completed and you learned that those parts weren't taxed
16	by and then the Board of Equalization.
17	Did Olympus, thereafter, rely on the outcome of
18	that audit to continue to not pay use tax on the repair
19	product parts used to repair the out-of-state
20	customer's equipment?
21	A Yes. Essentially, yes.
22	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. That's all I wanted to
23	clarify.
24	JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you very much.
25	Mr. Smith, you can proceed with your

1	presentation. We agreed to 20 minutes before. So you can
2	proceed now. Thanks.
3	MR. SMITH: Can I just ask a clarifying question?
4	So part of my presentation is addressing the 6596
5	issue. And I know she hasn't really addressed that yet.
6	So do you want me to do that now? you know, my
7	address that? Or wait until she's addressed that issue?
8	JUDGE LAMBERT: Well, I'll leave it up to you.
9	You could add more later if you want to respond to what
10	she states.
11	MR. SMITH: Okay.
12	JUDGE LAMBERT: But you could just address it
13	now
14	MR. SMITH: Okay.
15	JUDGE LAMBERT: if you want.
16	MR. SMITH: That's fine.
17	
18	PRESENTATION
19	MR. SMITH: Good morning.
20	At issue today is whether adjustments to the
21	measure of parts consumed in the optional maintenance
22	contracts are warranted; whether Appellant is entitled to
23	relief under Section 6596 based on prior audit advice; and
24	whether relief of the negligence penalty is warranted.

Appellant is a distributor, retailer, and

25

repairer of endoscopes and other devices. During the liability period from April 1, 2008, through September 30, 2011, the Appellant offered optional lump-sum maintenance contracts --

JUDGE LAMBERT: Mr. Smith, if you could just maybe slow down just a tad, It'll be easier for the stenographer to --

MR. SMITH: No problem.

2.4

JUDGE LAMBERT: -- transcribe. Thanks.

MR. SMITH: -- with the sales of endoscopes; under which, Appellant provided parts and labor for any necessary repairs and maintenance.

Specifically, Appellant purchased the parts, ex tax, from the manufacturer of the endoscopes, Olympus Medical Systems corporation, a related company located in Tokyo, Japan. And then Appellant stored the parts in a San Jose, California repair facility.

Pursuant to its maintenance contracts with its customers, the customer shipped the endoscopes parts to a San Jose repair facility via common carrier, where Appellant inspected and repaired the endoscopes using the parts purchased from Olympus Medical.

Appellant then shipped the repaired endoscopes via common carrier back to its customers, who were located within and outside of California.

Appellant did not bill its customers for the parts that it installed and did not report the purchase or consumption of the respective parts on its sales and use tax returns.

2.4

Turning to the law, use tax is imposed on the storage, use, or other consumption of tangible personal property purchased from any retailer for storage, use, or other consumption in the state unless that use is specifically exempted or excluded by statute.

Generally, use tax is owed by the person storing, using, or otherwise consuming the property in this state.

The term "storage" and "use" do not include keeping, retaining, or exercising of any right or power over tangible personal property for the purpose of subsequently transporting it outside the state for use thereafter solely outside the state.

When repair works -- repair work on property is performed under an optional lump-sum maintenance contract that provides for the furnishing of parts, materials, and labor necessary to maintain the property, the repair in regard of the consumer of the parts and materials furnished. That's Regulation 1546 and 1655.

If the repairer purchases the property for re-sale or from outside California without paying tax or tax reimbursement on the purchase price, they must report

and pay tax upon the cost of such property when the property is used in fulfillment of the optional warranty contract.

2.4

Here, the Appellant is liable for the use tax.

There is no dispute that Appellant purchased the parts at issue ex tax from Olympus medical, brought the repair parts into California, and stored the parts at the repair facility in San Jose.

There's no dispute that Appellant's out-of-state customers shipped endoscopes to Appellant in San Jose and that, in accordance with this optional maintenance warranty contracts, Appellant repaired the endoscopes using the parts at issue and then delivered the repaired endoscopes to a common carrier in California for shipment to its customers outside California.

Therefore, Appellant is regarded as a consumer of the parts and materials at issue and in accordance with Regulation 1546 Subdivision (b)(3)(C).

And because Appellant used the parts and materials at the repair facility in San Jose, Appellant consumed the property in California. The consumption of tangible personal property constitutes a taxable use.

Consequently, Appellant is liable for use tax on the consumption in California for the parts at issue.

Various Business Tax Law Guide Annotations

support this, including Annotation 315.0215, which states that "when a repairer is regarded as the consumer of the parts that it furnishes, tax applies to the repairer's purchase of the parts installed in California, even if the property's thereafter shipped to the customer outside California."

In addition, Annotation 315.0766 states that "even when the part is not installed at all but simply shipped directly to the customer out-of-state, use tax applies to the repairer's use of the property if it is delivered to a common carrier in California."

Section 60- -- Section -- sorry -- Section 6009.1 does not exclude Appellant's taxable use of the parts in this state because Appellant made a complete use of the parts in California, Appellant's use of the parts was complete upon installation into the customer's equipment or, at the latest, upon delivery to the common carrier in the state.

Appellant's use of the parts was complete and Section 6009.1 excludes use in California for the purpose of subsequent and exclusive use out of state. Here, Appellant made no use of the parts out of state whatsoever; and therefore, 6009.1 is inapplicable.

This conclusion is supported by the same annotations I cited previously. And specifically,

315.0766 specifically states that -- that 6009.1 does not apply when the repair part is delivered to a common carrier in California for shipment out of state.

More importantly, this conclusion is directly supported by the California Court of Appeals decision in Yamaha v. BOE, which held up, "when a gift is completed, upon delivery to a common carrier for shipment out of state, 6009.1 doesn't apply."

As here, the Court held that 6009.1 does not apply when a person's use of the property ends upon shipment out of state.

Regarding Appellant's claim that Regulation 1546 merely clarifies when a particular sale should be regarded as a sales tax or use tax transaction and that Regulation 1546 does not actually indicate when property is used or consumed, we agree that Regulation 1546 provides only that the repairer is regarded as the consumer of the parts furnished under an optional maintenance contract.

However, Regulation 1500 Subdivision (c)(3) specifically provides that, when a person is a consumer of tangible personal property, a sale to such person is a retail sale to which either the sales or use tax applies.

Thus Regulation 1546, together with Regulation 1500, make clear that the consumption or property qualifies as a taxable use. And a taxable use includes a

physical use of property by repairer under an optional maintenance contract.

2.4

Finally, the examples in Regulation 1620 involve use including installation of a repair part in state for the purpose of subsequent use out of state by that taxpayer.

Those examples are not applicable to parts consumed under optional warranty maintenance contracts where there is no subsequent use -- where there is no subsequent out-of-state use by the taxpayer.

Based on the foregoing, the repair parts at issue furnished and sold by Appellant in California to fulfill its contractual obligations under its optional maintenance warranty contracts are subject to tax.

Turning to Appellant's contention that it reasonably relied on erroneous written advice given by the Department during the prior audits, if -- if the Department finds that a person's failure to make a timely return or payment was due to the person's reasonable reliance on written advice --

(Reporter admonition)

MR. SMITH: Sure.

-- the person may be relieved of the taxes imposed and any penalty or interest.

If a previous audit of the person requesting

relief contained written evidence demonstrating that the issue in question was examined either on a sample or actual basis, such evidence will be considered written advice from the Department.

2.2

2.4

With respect to the first audit with a period ending March 31, 1999, limited records were available. The only records available consists of Verification Comments, Audit Schedule 12, and Audit Schedule 12-F, and a copy of the Reaudit Report dated February 21, 2003, provided by Appellant. And these are Exhibit B, pages 41 to 53.

The Verification Comments specifically indicate that Appellant did not provide the Department with any records related to the materials and parts consumed in optional maintenance contracts and that it estimated the amount for parts consumed based upon monthly contract billings as listed in Audit Schedule F.

Thus the Verification Comments in Schedule F show that there is no dispute that the Department estimated measure of tax -- measure of use tax due on the parts consumed under optional maintenance warranty contracts in the first audit.

Plus the Department did not erroneously advise the Appellant in writing that the parts and materials are not subject to tax in the first audit. Regarding the second audit, Appellant submitted a portion of a December 19, 2006 Reaudit Report, and a portion of the Verification Comments, and copy of Audit Schedule B of the audit work papers showing that the Department assessed use tax on parts consumed under optional maintenance warranty contracts related to various California customers. This is Exhibit B, pages 54 to 64.

2.4

Initially, we know that neither the Audit Report, the Verification Comments, nor Audit Schedule B contain any statement by the Department specifically advising that the parts installed in San Jose and ultimately shipped outside of California are excluded from tax.

Instead the Verification Comments specifically indicate that, pursuant to Regulation 1546, the Appellant is a consumer of parts used in the performance of its service contracts, and there is no mention in the comments that this advice is limited to those parts shipped within California.

Further, according to a letter issued by the Department, it specifically requested that Appellant submit a list of total parts used under its optional maintenance warranty contracts.

And it advised the Appellant that the parts furnished in connection with these warranties were taxable. In the letter, the Department also directed

Appellant to various annotations that make this point.

2.4

In addition, Audit Schedule 12-B-2 appears to consist of schedules produced by Appellant, which are comprised solely of transactions with California custom -- customers.

Plus the schedules corroborate the Department's claim that it simply requested a schedule of parts consumed in California, that Appellant provided a schedule of parts related only to California customers, and that the Department accepted this information.

Thus there is no basis to conclude that Appellant is entitled to 6596 relief as a result of the second audit.

Finally, regarding the third audit for the period ending December 31, 2007, Appellant submitted a Reaudit Report dated August 10, 2011; a portion of the audit Verification Comments; Audit Schedule I; and a memo dated January 11, 2010, from the Department to Appellant requesting a listing of all California customers with maintenance contracts. This is Exhibit B, pages 65 to 69.

As with the previous audits -- audits, neither the Audit Report, Verification Comments, or Audit Schedule state that use tax does not apply to parts installed and ultimately shipped outside of California.

In addition, the Verification Comments indicate

that Appellant had trouble locating records relating to its parts consumed under optional maintenance warranty plans. And as a result, both the Department and Appellant agreed to use an error percentage established during the previous audit of Appellant's account.

2.4

Thus, although the January 11, 2010 memo from the Department appears to request records related to Appellant's California customers, the Verification Comments in Schedule I show the Appellant did not provide the Department with any records relating to its parts consumed under its optional warranty contracts.

Consequently, since the Department did not examine the Appellant's use of parts consumed under its optional warranty contracts and since the Department did not indicate in any of the available audit work papers that the parts used to repair endoscopes ultimately shipped outside California were excluded from tax, Appellant is not entitled to relief of tax at issue under Section 6596, based on this third audit.

And to the extent that the Appellant argues that Department must have known that Appellant repaired endoscopes belonging to out-of-state customers, that is not the standard for relief under Section 6569.

That law only authorizes relief from tax when there is actual written evidence demonstrating that the

issue in question was examined. Therefore, Appellant is not entitled to relief of tax under Section 6596.

2.4

Finally, turning to the negligence penalty,

Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6484 provides for the

imposition of 10 percent penalty if any part of the

deficiency was due to negligence or intentional disregard

of the law or authorized -- authorized rules and

regulations.

Negligence -- negligence is defined as "a failure to do what a reasonable and prudent -- prudent person would do under the same or similar circumstances."

This was Appellant's fourth audit. According to the respective Reaudit Reports for the previous audits, the Department assessed use tax on unreported costs of parts consumed on each contract.

All of the -- and although the Department previously assessed use tax only on the parts used to repair property belonging to California customers, the evidence shows that Appellant failed to report any use tax on its parts consumed on optional maintenance contracts during the period at issue.

Thus even if we assume that Appellant reasonably believed that its use of the parts installed in endoscopes belonging to out-of-state customers were excluded from tax, Appellant's continued failure to report its purchase

1 of parts used to repair endoscopes belonging to in-state 2 customers is strong evidence of negligence. Moreover, the Reaudit Report shows that, as in 3 4 the current audit, Appellant failed to report purchases of 5 fixed assets subject to use tax, purchases of consumable supplies, and the use of loaner equipment. 6 Appellant's continued failure -- failure to 7 correct these errors is further evidence of negligence. 8 9 Thus a negligence penalty should be imposed. 10 This concludes my presentation. Thank you. 11 Thank you, Mr. Smith. I'm going JUDGE LAMBERT: 12 to turn to the panel now to see if they have any 13 questions. 14 Judge Geary, did you have any questions? 15 JUDGE GEARY: No. Thank you. JUDGE LAMBERT: And, Judge Ridenour, do you have 16 17 any questions? 18 JUDGE RIDENOUR: Also no. Thank you. 19 JUDGE LAMBERT: Thanks. 20 I have a couple of questions. I was just wanting 21 to clarify. On the Notice of Determination, it says that 22 the negligence penalty was a -- was imposed based on 23 both -- either 6478 or 6484.

one it is. Would it be 6484?

So I just want to clarify that -- that -- which

2.4

25

1 It would be 6484. MR. SMTTH: 2 JUDGE LAMBERT: Thanks. 3 And -- and just to clarify on 6009.1, CDTFA's 4 position that that exclusion could apply in some circumstances to an optional maintenance contract -- or is 5 it not something that would ever apply? 6 7 Or is there circumstances where it would apply? There's the annotation that was 315.0766, which 8 9 was discussing that it would tax when applying -- when the 10 installation occurs outside the state by company. 11 But if the parts are shipped to the out-of-state 12 customers for installation by the customer, tax applies at 13 the time of the shipment. I -- I can address that. 14 MR. CLAREMON: 15 JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. This is Scott Claremon. 16 MR. CLAREMON: 17 I think, with regard to those annotations, Yeah. 18 and similarly -- similarly, with regard to the Yamaha 19 holding, it depends on where the use ends. 20 So in the examples provided in those annotations, 21 when the use ends upon shipment within the State, when the 22 use by the taxpayer ends, then tax applies. 23 But I think in those examples if, for instance, 24 pursuant to an optional maintenance contract, a repair 25 part stored in California was shipped to the repairer's

facility out of state and then the repair was done out of state and then given to the customer there -- in that case, it was shipped and used thereafter by the repairer, the taxpayer.

2.4

So yes. There are circumstances where, under an optional maintenance contract, property stored in California could not be subject to tax pursuant to RTC 6009.1. But not in the facts presented here.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Claremon, for clarifying.

And just on the negligence penalty, I had a question. Under Regulation 1703, I believe there's certain factors that it discusses and if these apply -- whether the taxpayer was previously audit -- audited.

And in this case, the taxpayer was, but it doesn't seem like that issue was raised. Or maybe, if no one was aware of it, would that factor -- couldn't it still be the same in terms of negligence?

If -- if, in this case, it kind of seems like they weren't really previously audited on this -- this specific issue as opposed to -- so it may be comparable to being audited for the first time.

Would you comment on that possibility -- or if that would -- how you look at it.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I think the -- the point I was

trying to make is that they were audited on the in-state contracts previously, and they were assessed a deficiency.

2.4

And they, despite being assessed a deficiency three times previously on those in-state contracts -- they continued, in this audit, to not report that correctly.

MR. CLAREMON: And -- and I would add, I think that goes back to our statement with regard to the applicability of Section 6596 relief.

They were told that they owed tax on all of the repair parts for optional maintenance contracts that they presented to us.

So particularly in that first Audit, Schedule 12-F schedules all the optional maintenance contract transactions that were presented to us. There's no comment that other transactions were excluded from that.

So 12-F shows everything. And everything that was presented to us was a California transaction. And we said that was all taxable.

So every -- they were given the advice that for all the -- all the transactions that they presented to us, tax was owed. And so then they failed to follow that advice in subsequent audits.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Smith and Mr. Claremon.

I don't have any more questions at this time.

1	So we could turn to Ms. Silverstein, if you
2	wanted to continue your presentation. I believe you
3	wanted we we added we added some earlier time to
4	the your closing remarks remarks. And I have it
5	down that you have around 20 minutes.
6	And, you know, if CDTFA wants to give some
7	brief briefly respond to anything, I'll ask them after
8	that.
9	And then we I'll ask the panel, also, if they
10	have any questions. So you you can proceed with your
11	final remarks. You have 20 minutes. Thanks.
12	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. I'd also like to respond
13	to their arguments about 6009.1 first.
14	JUDGE LAMBERT: You can just include that in
15	your in your presentation.
16	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay.
17	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thanks.
18	
19	CLOSING ARGUMENT
20	MS. SILVERSTEIN: All right. So I think I heard
21	them make two arguments with respect to 6009.1 not
22	applying.
23	The first one is that there was the the repair
24	in California was a use in California. And to me that's

circular and doesn't take into account 6009.1.

25

Because the activity -- or the steps in the repair are exactly what 6009.1 describes -- incorporating or attaching a part to other tangible personal property for the purpose of shipping it out of state.

And so -- and we know that 6009.1, from the legislative history, was enacted to address repairs. So I don't think -- you know, it's -- it's basically just ignoring the statute to say "repair is a use," when the statute says, essentially, repair is not a use.

So that argument, I think, doesn't work.

The other argument that CDTFA makes is that the -- the -- Olympus did not use the property outside of the state. They shipped it from California, and then, you know, the customer was using it outside of the state.

Well that argument reads words into the statute. It's not what the statute says. The statute says that they performed the repair -- or -- or they -- let's see how does it -- that the exercise of -- of power over the tangible property -- the repair part -- was for the purpose of being attached or incorporated into the tangible property -- that's the repair -- to be transported outside of the state and thereafter used solely outside of the state.

It says nothing about who has to use it outside of the state.

What it's looking at is when the property's incorporated into the -- the -- the customer's product, was the purpose to attach it and to transport it outside of the state for use solely outside of the state.

2.2

Clearly, that's satisfied because they did transport it outside of the state for use outside of the state. It doesn't matter whose use outside of the state it is. Because the statute doesn't say either customer or taxpayer -- repairer.

Either one would be fine. It just has to be for the purpose of using it solely outside of the state. To confine the statute to use by the repairer would read words into the statute, which obviously is not permitted under principles of the statutory construction.

So then CDTFA says, "Well, there are annotations on point that confirm this."

The first point I want to make is that annotations, in general, are very weak authority. They don't state all the facts. They're very terse. They were -- perhaps in this case -- the BOE's position based on BOE's understanding of the facts at the time they were written.

So you know, in court, certainly -- and I assume the same is here too -- they're, you know -- they can be considered, but they're -- they're not strong authority.

And I wanted to get to this. There's a case I believe is stronger authority. But before I get there, they cite two annotations:

One of them we address in our brief. That is -- let's see -- 315.0215. And I think what we say in our brief is adequate to rebut its applicability here.

But just, very briefly, what we say is that there's a key sentence that says that tax applies to the repairman's purchase of the parts. And so, basically, what the annotation is saying is that sales tax applies to the transaction.

And so it's our position that -- well, and -- and therefore, the repairman purchased the parts inside of California, which is not our facts. And to the extent that's it's about sales tax, 6009.1 doesn't apply to sales tax.

So it's our position that that's inapplicable. And that's in our brief if you want to go back to that.

For some reason, we didn't address the other one in our brief. And I'm not sure if they're raising it for the first time. It probably did come up at some point in this case.

I -- I have it here. And I -- I looked at it. Basically, I -- I do think it makes that same point about the use needing to be use by the taxpayer-repairer and not

use by a different company that they're repairing it for.

But again, as I mentioned, it's the same response that that's not what the statute says. It's an improper interpretation of the statute.

One other -- other thing I forgot to mention is, Bob testified, the Pullman Company did have two entities. So we believe the facts there are analogous to our facts.

Even though they were commonly owned, of course, for sales and use tax purposes -- and really, in general, under the law -- separate entities are respected as separate entities. So that shouldn't be viewed as any different than the separate entities here.

We don't need to rely on that. That's, you know, extra information that's not in the legislative history. I think it's an interesting fact. But as I said, what is determinative is the language of the statute and applying principles of statutory construction and the words that the statue support -- application, regardless of who uses the property outside of California.

I think that gets us to the relief provision.

We're asking for relief under 6596 as a result of the -because of the results of the audit.

I want to make very clear, we're not conceding anything by making this argument. We don't and will never agree that 6009.1 doesn't apply here. But to the extent

that the panel disagrees, in the alternative, we do ask for relief under 6596.

2.

2.4

I think that the -- the CDTFA's presentation of, like, kind of what facts are relevant and how they presented it is not faithful to the terms of the regulation.

If you look at the regulation, there's a specific section that discusses written advice provided in a prior audit. And it doesn't at all require that, you know, there's any sort of statement that, in this case, repair parts for out-of-state customers' equipment is not subject to use tax. No statement like that needs to be, you know -- needs to be in the audit results.

Basically, they say it has to contain written evidence which demonstrate that the issue in question was examined.

And then, its written advice -- or the -- the requirement of the advice is satisfied when the activity or transaction in question -- when the -- the Audit Report shows that the activity or transaction in question was properly reported and no amount was due, that's sufficient for a finding for relief from liability -- is what the statute -- or what the regulation says.

This is in Subdivision (c) about 10 lines down -- or 20 lines down from the top.

So basically, what -- in order to give relief to Olympus under this statute and regulation, this Board needs to find that, in one of the three audits -- it doesn't have to be all three -- that CDTFA -- or I'm sorry -- BOE at the time examined the issue, and then the result was that no tax was due.

2.4

And so it's our position that the -- the issue that was examined is whether repair parts used at the San Jose facility are taxable. And clearly that issue was examined.

We know that, ultimately, BOE taxed the repair parts for California customers and didn't tax the repair parts for the non-California customers.

So the issue of "Are repair parts taxable?" was examined. And the result was there was no tax on the repair parts for the non-California customer repairs.

So it's our position that that satisfies the terms of 6596. And relief should be -- should be permitted or afforded.

But to the extent that, you know, the question is, you know, "Did they know" -- did -- "Did BOE know there were non-California customers?" You know, there was kind of an implication that Olympus, you know, wasn't forthcoming.

I believe that there's clear evidence in each of

the audits that BOE did make a -- a conscious decision to tax only the parts for the California customer repairs.

2.4

In the first audit, there's a -- a statement about having looked -- or, you know, reviewed records or sales reported by state. And it -- to me, that indicates that they saw, you know, the sales by state; right?

And so they saw the sales for California customers and non-California customers and then chose to tax only the repairs -- repair parts used for the non-California customers. I believe that's in the second audit too.

But in the third audit, they specifically ask for the California sales. And so, you know, there's an implication there that they weren't asking for all sales -- I mean, not an implication -- it's clear that there -- there is an express statement; they weren't asking for all sales.

So in -- in choosing to ask just for the California sales, it's indicative of them, you know, making a conscious decision not to tax the repair parts for the out-of-state customer repairs.

And, you know, there's no question that they knew that there were repairs performed for out-of-state customers. That -- I don't think that was even disputed. And so, you know, why would they ask for just the

California sales?

2.4

The only plausible reason is that they intend -that they intended to tax only the California sales and
not the out-of-state sales or repairs -- I should say -repairs for in-state customers and not the repairs for
out-of-state customers.

And I think that gets us to the negligence penalty. And here, to me, the issue is whether the negligence penalty can be applied on, you know, just the portion of the deficiency that related to the repairs for California customers and not on the portion of the deficiency that related to repairs for the out-of-state customers.

Their reasons they didn't report and pay tax on the -- the repair parts and the consumables used with respect -- well, consumables -- all consumables were -- but repair parts used with respect to the California customers' repairs.

There's reasons they did that. That was basically de minimus. And the time and effort to do that was, you know -- frankly, they knew that it was going to be audited. They knew they were going to pay it. And they always did pay it. And they never disputed it.

But it's our position that it would be inequitable to impose the penalty for, you know -- based

on the -- the taxpayer's behavior with respect to this very small amount to -- and then impose the penalty on this very large amount -- and that's the tax that relates to the out-of-state customers' repairs.

2.4

The CDTFA's own manual indicates that there's discretion to apply the penalty to only a portion of the deficiency when it would be inequitable to apply it to all of it.

And to the extent that they have discretion, it's our position that the -- the panel also has discretion to interpret it that way. And, you know, just based on the pure equities, they obviously were not negligent with respect to not paying tax on the repair parts for the out-of-state customers repairs.

There's a statute directly on point. They -- the CD -- BOE had never taxed those before. It was their understanding that they were not taxable.

I know there was questions that were asked about -- "Well, when did you come to the 6009.1 position?"

I don't think that that's the pertinent question with respect to either 6596 or the negligence penalty.

Because, you know, basically they were basing their understanding on these transactions not being subject to use tax.

Actually, I should say, we don't really know all

the reasons. I mean, it predates Bob. It's very possible that they came to the conclusion that 6009.1 applies. But what's really pertinent here is that -- is the -- the non-taxation, time after time, by BOE.

And so, you know, this panel might or might not decide that the issue was, you know -- was audited. We think it was. But surely, relying on the outcome of those audits precludes any finding of negligence. So -- with respect to those transactions.

So that's our position on that. And we urge the panel to use the CDTFA manual's guidance -- that they can apply the penalty to only a portion of the deficiency based only on an inequity.

That's the conclusion of my presentation for now, I think. I'm happy to answer any questions. And then if I could reserve one last rebuttal, I'd appreciate it.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Yeah. Sure. I'll have C -- CDTFA, if you have any brief remarks -- anything to add?

MR. CLAREMON: We -- we would just reiterate that, even in the context of an audit, and even -- it -- it still requires written evidence that the issue was examined.

And here, particularly with the first audit -that when you read those Verification Comments, it appears
that they began the examination of the reported sales,

which were the total sales or sales made in California, there were various exclusions and exemptions that are listed out of -- sales, and interstate commerce was not one of them.

2.4

And once they began the examination of California sales to determine whether they had failed to erroneously report its sales as ex tax -- that is when they separated out the optional maintenance contracts into transactions to Schedule 12-F.

So the -- the appearance being that they were separating out from the other California sales.

And again, there is no comment that 12-F excludes transactions they looked at. There's no comment that they only listed the California transactions on 12-F but did not list out-of-state transactions. There's no comment that it only lists the taxable transactions.

So the written evidence in those audit work papers is that the only transactions examined with regard to optional maintenance contracts were California contracts.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Claremon.

I'll just turn to my panel and see if they have any questions for either party at this time.

Judge Geary, did you have any questions?

JUDGE GEARY: No questions. Thank you.

1	JUDGE LAMBERT: And, Judge Ridenour, do you have
2	any questions?
3	JUDGE RIDENOUR: No questions. Thank you.
4	JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. I have I have a
5	question.
6	I was just wanting clarified that maybe CDTFA
7	could clarify but the negligence penalty is applying to
8	both entire assessment.
9	Is that both California and non-California
10	customers?
11	MR. SMITH: Yes. That is correct.
12	JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. And thank you.
13	And, Ms. Silverstein, I believe you were touching
14	on this that you you're saying the negligence
15	penalty should not apply to the non-California customers
16	versus the California customers.
17	Is that what you were stating?
18	MS. SILVERSTEIN: That's correct.
19	JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. And then, when you were
20	explaining why was the were the California customers
21	reported then?
22	Or were you saying it wasn't material? And if
23	they do, they were going to be audited?
24	MS. SILVERSTEIN: Well
25	JUDGE LAMBERT: I guess, if the if the

position was that -- that only the non-California customers are not taxed, then why wouldn't -- wouldn't the California customers' tax be reported, then, in the first place?

MS. SILVERSTEIN: We concede that the tax -- the tax is due on the repair parts for the California customers' equipment and also that it was not reported.

I'm never going to say my client was negligent. But we're not disputing that portion of the negligence penalty.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. You're not disputing the California customers' part.

MS. SILVERSTEIN: Correct.

2.4

But we're saying that should not then be parlayed into negligence for the entire assessment because the Cal- -- the tax on the California customers' repair parts is -- it was -- roughly, if you look at -- across all the audit periods -- it's about \$200,000 to \$2 million.

So the statute doesn't prohibit -- the negligence penalty statute doesn't prohibit applying the negligence penalty to a portion of the assessment. And CDTFA's own guidance indicates that it shouldn't be applied to the whole assessment if it would be inequitable to do so.

And my argument -- and I firmly believe this -- is that there's no argument that there's -- that my client

1 was negligent with respect to the tax on the repair parts 2 for the out-of-state customers. 3 Okay. Thank you for clarifying. JUDGE LAMBERT: 4 One more question -- or maybe a couple. 5 keep this brief, hopefully. Just that -- I want to clarify. 6 Are you stating that the Regulation 1564 is just 7 not applicable? And would there be a situation where, you 8 9 know, 6009.1 would apply? 10 Because we saw these videos of certain types of repairs. And I think your -- maybe you could clarify --11 but the point was that it's kind of, like, a minor repair. 12 13 It's not really using the device. 14 So are you say -- saying there's certain types of 15 different repairs where it would be more of a functional use versus these kinds of repairs? 16 17 Or what -- what would be the significance of the 18 type of repair? MS. SILVERSTEIN: 19 No. That the -- the -- the 20 operative fact -- or the -- the determinative fact 21 is the shipment outside of the state for use outside of 2.2 the state. 23 So 1546 is relevant because it applies to 24 optional maintenance contracts. And it -- its function is

to say that when there's a repair, the -- if there's going

25

to be a tax, it's going to be a use tax on the repairer.

2.4

And so, in the case of repairs for California customers' equipment -- that the -- that regulation would result in -- you know, the -- the regulation says that's a use in California because it's a use in California and there's no exclusion, then use tax applies.

So that's how we all get to the position we agree on that Cal- -- the tax was due on the repair parts with respect to the repairs of the California customers' equipment.

But that reg. doesn't say tax applies all the time. It just says that there's -- the repairer used -- is -- is considered to have used the -- the -- the repair parts.

Then you go to the statute to the extent that the repair parts were repaired for the purpose of shipping them outside the state and then for use outside the state, 6009.1 comes into play.

And it basically trumps everything. And it provides that those transactions are excluded from use and so there's no use tax.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Ms. Silverstein.

MS. SILVERSTEIN: Okay.

JUDGE LAMBERT: And at this point, was there more that you wanted to present -- maybe just briefly perhaps -- like, to add? I think you wanted to add a little bit more?

## FURTHER CLOSING ARGUMENT

MS. SILVERSTEIN: I think we actually made all of our points. I -- I -- I just -- I would urge the panel to examine those audit reports. Because I don't see anywhere that, in the first audit at least, the taxpayer reported on the California sales.

And, in any event -- to the extent that that's CDTFA's position -- they haven't addressed the other two audits other than saying, "Well, those auditors -- or the subsequent auditors must have just followed what the earlier auditors did."

If you take a step back and you look at this entire period -- three audits of, you know, roughly 12 years of so -- and they're full audits. They're not just audits of -- of this issue. They're audits of all the sales and use tax of the company -- the auditors, you know, clearly understood this was a worldwide company.

They knew about the San Jose company. They saw, you know, sales reports, you know, by destination. And, you know, each one of those auditors determined, you

know -- or at least did not tax the repair parts for the out-of-state customers' equipment.

2.4

So, you know -- I mean to -- to think -- and the last auditor specifically asked just -- or asked for California sales indicating that they were making a determination they didn't need the out-of-state sales.

So it's our position that this does constitute written advice -- that the written advice is, you know, no change. This does constitute written advice, under the regulation, that those items were not taxable.

But just to sum up, obviously our main argument that we believe is -- this whole case should be resolved on is 6009.1.

I don't really need to reiterate everything I said because I think it's very clear from the description of the repair process and the videos that the repair process is removing the defective part, replacing it with the new repair part that was exactly the same all for the purpose of shipping it back to the customer for use outside of the state.

These repairs follow exactly the terms of 6009.1. The statute couldn't be more clear that it excludes these repair parts from use. Excluding them from use means there's no use tax.

And -- oh. I -- I did forget to mention the case

that I think is more -- I know is more determinative than the reg. or the annotations. It's cited in our papers. It's the Atchison case.

2.4

And it, you know, basically involved a railroad where a part was -- a railroad was repaired in California. And it was a special kind of repair part that could only be used on certain types of tracks. And the -- the train was then transported outside of the -- outside of the state.

And the taxpayer argued that the trains came back to California. The taxpayer argued that the repair part was never used in California. And the reason they said that is because the repair -- the repair part could only be used on certain kinds of tracks that were outside of California.

So technically, it couldn't be used in California. But it was part of the train. And the outcome in the court case was that the taxpayer lost because the -- the train was came back to California and was used in California.

But I think the reason this case is really important is because it does interpret 6009.1. It interprets it in the context of -- of a repair -- exactly, you know, our facts.

And there's no indication that the repair itself

1	was a use that in and of itself would be, you know make
2	the the repair part subject to tax. The only question
3	was whether the repair part was actually used in
4	California after the fact.
5	So it's our position that, you know, it's the
6	closest case on point. There aren't any other cases. It
7	does support our case. And it's certainly more
8	authoritative than annotations.
9	So to sum it all up, really, all the panel needs
10	to do is read the statute, apply the facts to the statute,
11	and we urge the panel to grant the taxpayer's appeal.
12	Thank you.
13	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Ms. Silverstein.
14	If there's nothing further, I'm going to conclude
15	the hearing.
16	So I want to thank both parties CDTFA and
17	Ms. Silverstein and Mr. Tobin for testifying. And we
18	will issue a written opinion within 100 days.
19	And the record is now closed.
20	Thank you.
21	(Proceedings concluded at 11:28 a.m.)
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Sarah M. Tuman, RPR, CSR No. 14463, a
4	Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of
5	California, do hereby certify:
6	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before
7	me at the time and place herein set forth; that any
8	witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to
9	testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the
10	proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand, which
11	was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the
12	foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony
13	given.
14	Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the
15	original transcript of a deposition in a federal case,
16	before completion of the proceedings, review of the
17	transcript [] was [x] was not requested.
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.
21	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed
22	my name.
23	Dated: November 7, 2022 Sarah M. Tuman, CSR RPR, CSR No. 14463
24	Certified Shorthand Reporter

25

For The State of California

\$	<b>1620</b> 42:23 43:5, 10 44:6 53:3	<b>31</b> 54:6 56:15	<b>63</b> 4:20
<u> </u>	<b>1620(b)(9)</b> 43:8	<b>315.0215</b> 51:1 66:5	<b>64</b> 55:7
<b>\$2</b> 76:18	<b>1655</b> 49:22	<b>315.0766</b> 51:7	<b>6478</b> 59:23
<b>\$200</b> 37:13	<b>1703</b> 61:12	52:1 60:8	<b>6484</b> 58:4 59:23, 25 60:1
<b>\$200,000</b> 41:24 76:18	<b>18</b> 28:3	4	<b>65</b> 56:20
<b>\$300,000</b> 41:25	<b>1800's</b> 26:13		<b>6569</b> 57:23
<b>\$43</b> 17:1,2,15	<b>1873</b> 26:15	<b>40</b> 30:19	<b>6596</b> 6:11 47:4,23
<b>\$83</b> 37:15	<b>19</b> 55:2	<b>400</b> 2:16	56:12 57:19 58:2
	<b>19125560</b> 2:6 5:6	<b>41</b> 54:10	62:8 67:21 68:2 69:18 72:21
(	<b>1926</b> 37:9	<b>43</b> 30:21	<b>666</b> 16:25 17:14
(b)(3)(c) 50:49	<b>1942</b> 36:2,4	<b>45</b> 7:6,18 28:3	<b>69</b> 56:20
(b)(3)(c) 50:18	<b>1943</b> 23:2 30:20	<b>46</b> 4:14	
<b>(b)(9)</b> 43:13,15,19	36:3,6 37:15	<b>47</b> 4:11	7
(c) 68:24	<b>1979</b> 16:23 17:16	<b>48</b> 19:9 31:22	<b>7</b> 4:10
<b>(c)(3)</b> 52:19	<b>1996</b> 39:23		
1	<b>1999</b> 54:6	5	<b>70</b> 12:6
·		<b>53</b> 54:11	<b>79</b> 4:21
<b>1</b> 6:14 48:2	2	<b>54</b> 55:7	8
<b>1-12</b> 4:4 6:16	<b>2</b> 15:16	<b>34</b> 33.7	
<b>10</b> 56:16 58:5 68:24	<b>20</b> 2:18 5:1,7 47:1	6	<b>8</b> 17:24 18:6,7,8, 10,11
<b>100</b> 82:18	63:5,11 68:25	<b>6</b> 4:4,5	
<b>11</b> 4:14 56:18 57:6	<b>2003</b> 54:9	<b>60-</b> 51:12	9
<b>11:28</b> 2:18 82:21	<b>2006</b> 55:2	<b>6009</b> 45:14,17	<b>9</b> 43:12
<b>12</b> 6:14 54:8 79:18	<b>2007</b> 56:15	<b>6009.1</b> 6:9 9:5	<b>9:43</b> 2:17 5:2
	<b>2008</b> 48:2	10:19 21:16	
<b>12-B-2</b> 56:2	<b>2010</b> 56:18 57:6	22:12,17 23:2	<b>9:44</b> 5:8
<b>12-F</b> 54:8 62:13,16 74:9,12,14	<b>2011</b> 48:3 56:16	27:7 30:19 31:3, 15 35:10,20 38:6	Α
<b>14463</b> 2:19	<b>2014</b> 25:11	39:2,12,20 40:12	
<b>1500</b> 52:19,24	<b>2022</b> 2:18 5:1,7	41:5,8,10 42:15, 24 43:5,9,20 44:6,	<b>A-E</b> 4:5 6:18
,	<b>21</b> 54:9	24 45:2 51:12,20,	<b>a.m.</b> 2:17,18 5:2,8
<b>1546</b> 40:22 43:3,6 49:22 50:18	<b>25</b> 11:18	23 52:1,8,9 60:3	82:21
52:12,15,16,23		61:8 63:13,21,25 64:2,5 66:15	abruptly 8:11
55:14 77:23	<b>29</b> 4:14	67:25 72:19 73:2	accepted 56:10
<b>1546(b)(3)(c)</b> 40:23	3	77:9 78:18 80:13, 21 81:22	accordance 50:11,17
<b>1564</b> 77:7	<b>30</b> 48:2	<b>6009.1-relevant</b> 35:13	account 57:5

Index: accounting..auditors

63:25 33:19 7:11 47:22,25 argues 9:2 57:20 48:3,11,13,16,21, afforded 69:19 accounting argument 4:18 23 49:1 50:4,5,10, 11:14 9:21 27:7 63:19 agree 8:9 22:18 12,16,19,20,23 64:10,11,15 67:24 acknowledged 52:16 67:25 78:7 51:14,22 53:12 76:24,25 79:6 24:16 54:10,13,24 55:1, agreed 6:5 24:15 80:11 14,20,23 56:1,3,8, activity 64:1 47:1 57:4 11,15,18 57:1,3,9, arguments 68:18,20 63:13,21 agreements 18,20,21 58:1,19, 22 59:4 actual 15:23 54:3 26:13 assessed 8:12 57:25 appellant's 4:4, air 13:8,9,14 44:19 55:5 58:14,17 add 28:4 47:9 62:6 13 6:16 50:9 62:2,3 aircraft 44:11 73:18 79:3 51:13,15,19 52:12 assessment 31:7 **ALJ** 3:3.5 53:15 57:5,8,13 added 63:3 75:8 76:15,21,23 58:12,25 59:7 alternative 68:1 addition 51:7 **assets** 59:5 applicability 62:8 56:2,25 America 2:6 5:6 66:6 **assume** 33:10 **address** 47:7,12 58:22 65:23 amount 34:5 applicable 43:9 60:14 64:6 66:4, 41:17 54:16 68:21 53:7 77:8 assuming 30:23 72:2,3 application 67:18 Atchison 81:3 addressed 47:5.7 **Amy** 3:7 5:21 8:1 applied 71:9 79:13 40:21 attach 65:3 76:22 addresses 10:5 attached 9:9 23:9 analogous 67:7 45:6 applies 9:25 35:4 44:2 64:20 **analysis** 31:3,15 10:18 45:4 51:3, addressing 47:4 attaching 64:3 10 52:22 60:12,22 annotation 51:1, 66:8,10 73:2 adequate 66:6 7 60:8 66:10 attending 5:18 77:23 78:6,11 adjustments annotations attorney 23:5 apply 10:2,22 47:20 36:16 50:25 51:25 56:1 21:23 27:22 52:2, 60:17,20 65:15,18 administration audit 14:12 31:4 8,10 56:23 60:4,6, 66:3 81:2 82:8 3:11 11:12 39:13 41:8,14,25 7 61:13 66:15 **annual** 17:1,15 42:9 46:14,18 67:25 72:6.7 administrative 47:23 53:25 54:5, 73:12 75:15 77:9 5:9 6:17,19 7:12 apparently 23:7, 8,17,22,25 55:1,3, 82:10 17 26:3 admitted 34:20 4,8,9 56:2,13,14, applying 60:9 16,17,22 57:5,15, appeal 2:5 5:5 admonition 12:9 63:22 67:16 75:7 27:23 82:11 19 58:12 59:4 53:21 76:20 61:14 62:5,12 Appeal's 5:5 **advice** 47:23 67:22 68:9,13,19 appreciated Appeals 2:1 52:5 70:3,11,12 73:20, 53:16,20 54:4 45:23 23 74:17 76:18 55:17 62:19,22 appearance approval 15:4,6 79:9,10 68:8,17,18 80:8,9 74:10 18:22 audited 41:19,20 advise 54:23 **APPEARANCES** Approximately 61:14,20,22 62:1 advised 55:23 3:1 17:22 71:22 73:6 75:23 adviser 22:20 appears 31:23 April 48:2 auditor 22:18 56:2 57:7 73:24 39:11 40:12 80:4 advising 55:10 argued 81:10,11 Appellant 2:7 3:7 auditors 41:14 affirmatively 5:20 6:9,11,14

Index: audits..characterization

79:14,15,16,21,25 basically 20:19 43:19 call 12:21 15:3 27:6 33:12 43:19 18:21 32:9,17 **audits** 8:5 31:5 **boxes** 25:17,22 44:14 45:8 64:7 33:6,7 39:6,8 41:10,24 66:9.24 68:14 breach 14:21 **called** 7:11 14:23 46:10 53:17 56:21 69:1 71:20 72:22 58:13 62:22 69:3 briefing 42:22,24 22:23 23:7 37:6, 78:19 81:4 70:1 73:8 79:14, 18 briefly 63:7 66:7 18,19,20 **basing** 72:22 camera 42:5 79:2 August 56:16 **basis** 41:11 43:2 broken 8:20 car 23:13 24:9 54:3 56:11 authoritative 26:12 37:6,11,23 brought 50:6 **batch** 36:6 45:16 82:8 38:1,16 **bunch** 26:3 authorities 9:21 bed 19:15.16 carrier 48:20.24 business 11:12 50:14 51:11,17 authority 32:20 began 73:25 74:5 52:3,7 12:1 17:24 19:12 65:18,25 66:2 behalf 7:11 20:9 23:8 24:14 cars 23:9 26:18,19 authorization 25:8 26:1,11,17, behavior 72:1 36:22,23 37:1,12, 18:20 21 36:22 37:11,19 13,24 38:2,10 believed 58:23 38:16,17 40:6,7 authorized 58:7 42:5 50:25 case 5:6 8:2 9:19, belonging 57:22 authorizes 57:24 23 10:15 27:1,19 58:18,24 59:1 **buying** 13:17 28:7 44:25 61:3, automatically 15,19 65:20 66:1, bending 14:23,25 30:6 C 22 68:10 78:2 benefit 13:2 **Avenue** 16:23 80:12,25 81:3,18, 21 82:6,7 bill 29:17 35:9 Cal- 76:16 78:8 aware 34:1 61:17 36:1 38:5 49:1 **cases** 82:6 California 2:2,16, billings 54:17 21 3:10 5:1 6:8 **CD** 72:16 R 8:4,6,19 11:22 bills 35:23 **CDTFA** 5:12,14 17:20,23,25 bachelor's 11:12 6:21 9:2,21 10:1,3 bit 16:20 32:5 79:4 18:10,11 21:13,20 15:20 27:21 28:10 **back** 8:22 14:12 23:13,20,21 24:1, **blow** 13:9 29:2 31:12 41:9 10,14 27:17 31:10 19:6,7,8,11,20,21, 63:6 64:11 65:15 **Board** 8:5,11 23:4 34:15 36:23 37:1, 24 20:7 23:3,15 24:15 26:23 46:16 69:4 73:11,18 24:13 26:13 21 38:1,8,11,12 75:6 82:16 69:2 31:20,22 32:10,14 40:3,6 48:17,25 49:24 50:7,14,15, 33:7 37:15 39:18 **CDTFA's** 60:3 **Bob** 5:23 11:10 48:24 62:7 66:18 21,24 51:4,6,11, 68:3 72:5 76:21 67:6 73:1 79:17 80:19 15,20 52:3,5 79:13 **body** 12:19,23 81:10,19 53:12 55:7,12,18 center 15:3 32:9, 14:19 56:4,8,9,19,24 background 18,23 57:8,17 58:18 **BOE** 52:6 69:5,11, 11:11 60:25 61:7 62:17 Certified 2:20 21 70:1 72:16 balance 37:12,13, 63:24 64:13 66:14 73:4 change 8:11 67:19 69:12 70:2, 24 40:16,17 80:9 **BOE's** 65:20,21 7,13,19 71:1,3,11, base 24:17 17 74:1,5,11,14, changed 8:11 boggled 31:21 19 75:9,16,20 **based** 31:3,14 channel 13:8 **books** 30:19 76:3,6,12,16 78:2, 32:25 37:20 41:10 5,9 79:11 80:5 47:23 53:11 54:16 characterization **boss** 25:20 81:5,11,12,15,17, 57:19 59:22 65:20 32:3

**bottom** 14:18

71:25 72:11 73:13

19,20 82:4

Index: charge..contracts

**charge** 15:10 co-panelists complaint 15:4 constitute 80:7,9 20:10 5:10 complete 33:13 constitutes charged 8:24 Code 9:4 22:12 51:14,16,19 50:22 58:4 **chefs** 26:20 completed 46:15 construction coherent 27:21 52:6 65:14 67:17 Chicago 25:17, colonoscope compliance consulting 32:8 21,25 11:23 12:17 choosing 70:18 consumable colonoscopes comprised 16:3 59:5 **chose** 70:8 12:7 14:14 56:4 consumables circular 63:25 colonoscopies concede 76:5 21:25 22:4.8 circumstances 12:7,16 34:12,14 71:15,16 conceding 67:23 45:17 58:11 60:5. colonoscopy consumed 22:7 7 61:5 concentration 19:12 47:21 50:21 52:16 11:13 cite 66:3 53:8 54:14,16,21 combined 29:18 concerned 21:3 55:5 56:8 57:2,11, cited 51:25 81:2 commencing 13 58:15,20 conclude 28:13 **cites** 9:21 2:17 56:11 82:14 consumer 10:8, 11,15 49:21 50:16 claim 52:12 56:7 comment 61:23 concluded 82:21 62:15 74:12.13.15 51:2 52:17,20 Claremon 3:12 concludes 59:10 55:15 5:16 60:14,16 comments 20:23 35:24 54:8,12,18 concluding 2:17 consuming 61:9 62:6.24 49:11 73:19 74:21 55:3,9,13,16 conclusion 27:7 56:17,22,25 57:9 39:7 51:24 52:4 consumption clarified 75:6 73:24 49:3,6,8 50:21,24 73:2,14 clarifies 52:13 52:24 commerce 74:3 conducting 5:9 **clarify** 28:22 46:2, **common** 14:24 contact 22:21 23 59:21,24 60:3 conference 6:5 48:20,24 50:14 contained 54:1 75:7 77:6,11 51:11,17 52:2,7 confine 65:12 contention 53:15 clarifying 47:3 commonly 67:8 confirm 6:22 33:4 61:10 77:3 context 15:24 65:16 companies 23:25 73:20 81:23 clear 15:16 24:25 24:20 27:16 congress 36:2 25:3,5 26:22 27:8 continue 46:18 company 22:23 40:18 52:24 67:23 connection 63:2 23:7 25:18 26:1 69:25 70:15 30:14 36:11.16 continued 58:25 80:15,22 30:13,22 35:14 55:24 59:7 62:5 36:7,8,10,25 37:3, Cleveland 20:4,6, conscious 39:22 6,7,11,23 38:1,16 contract 6:8 8:25 41:16 70:1,20 48:15 60:10 67:1, 10:7 15:10 18:3, client 76:8,25 6 79:21,22,23 consideration 14 20:11 29:15,16 29:1 company's 25:25 **Clinic** 20:4,8 45:3 49:18 50:3 31:13,15 52:18 53:2 54:16 considered 54:3 **closed** 82:19 58:15 60:5,24 65:25 78:13 comparable 61:6 62:13 closer 6:1 17:4 61:21 consist 56:3 contracts 10:6 closest 82:6 complained consistent 25:8.9 16:6,9 29:21,24 23:17 closing 4:18 63:4, 31:6,10 40:24 consists 54:7 19 79:6

Index: contractual..documents

determinative 45:6 47:22 48:4, custom 56:4 56:15 18 50:12 53:8,14 67:16 77:20 81:1 decide 73:6 customer 8:18, 54:15,21 55:6,16, determine 15:7.8 22,24 10:19 15:1, 22 56:20 57:11,14 **decision** 31:2.14 18:25 45:11 74:6 11 16:6 18:2,14, 58:20 62:2,4,10 39:22 41:16 52:5 21 19:7,23,25 74:8,19,20 77:24 70:1,20 determined 29:17 30:5 32:13, 79:25 contractual 18,23,25 33:16, defective 19:1 53:13 **device** 77:13 20,22 34:2,15,16 20:5 23:13 32:7 48:19 51:5,9 80:17 control 12:20 devices 48:1 60:12 61:2 64:14 14:7 deficiency 58:6 65:8 69:16 70:2, diagnosing 13:3 62:2,3 71:10,12 controls 12:20 21 80:19 72:7 73:12 diagnosis 33:13 customer's 6:7 **copy** 54:9 55:3 defined 58:9 diagram 12:8 8:23 9:13.15 corporate 11:20 14:7 10:23 27:12 46:20 delays 19:20 51:16 65:2 corporation diagrams 14:5 delivered 50:13 48:15 customers 8:6,8, 51:11 52:2 **DIRECT** 4:13 11:6 10 10:17 17:20,23 correct 7:2 16:17, delivery 51:17 directed 55:25 20:10 21:13,20 19 30:15,25 34:16 52:7 29:13 30:15,24 46:12 59:8 75:11, **directly** 8:15 9:18 31:10 39:4 41:12 18 76:13 demonstrate 44:19 51:9 52:4 48:19,24 49:1 68:15 72:15 correctly 62:5 50:10.15 55:7 demonstrating disagrees 68:1 corroborate 56:6 56:5,9,19 57:8,22 54:1 57:25 58:18,24 59:2 disassemble cost 15:8,11 50:1 60:12 69:12.13.22 Department 3:10 19:1 70:8,10,24 71:5,6, costs 58:14 5:15 39:25 53:17, discourage 11,13 72:14 18 54:4,13,19,23 country 23:10,12 23:25 75:10,15,16,20 55:5,10,20,25 34:7 76:2 77:2 56:10,18 57:3,7, discretion 72:6,9, 10,12,14,21 **couple** 17:16 10 customers' 8:13 38:25 40:19 59:20 58:14,16 9:3 42:17 46:12 discussed 6:20 77:4 68:11 71:18 72:4 department's 4:5 41:9 76:3,7,12,16 78:3, court 52:5,9 65:23 6:18 56:6 discusses 61:13 9 80:2 81:18 depends 60:19 68:8 **cut** 14:22 cover 14:23,25 describe 18:13 discussing 60:9 20:20 22:13 33:8 **dispute** 6:23,24 D **CROSS** 4:13 describes 27:8 40:22 50:5,9 CROSS-64:2 54:19 **date** 5:7 **EXAMINATION** description disputed 70:24 dated 26:15 54:9 29:7 80:15 71:23 56:16,17 cross-out 35:3 designed 13:15 **disputing** 76:9,11 **dating** 26:13 **CSR** 2:19 destination disregard 58:6 days 20:7 25:22 79:24 **culled** 34:23 82:18 distributor 47:25 determination current 11:19 **de** 71:20 documents 29:1 59:21 80:6 39:13 41:8 42:9 25:18 34:20,22,23 December 55:2 59:4 35:13 36:6 38:13

downtown 25:25 entities 37:5 67:6, 74:5 34:21 10,11,12 dozens 35:7 examine 57:13 expanded 42:10 entitled 6:10 79:9 drafts 35:2 expands 13:10 47:22 56:12 57:18 examined 7:13 **due** 9:25 10:13 58:2 experienced 54:2 58:1 68:16 53:19 54:20 58:6 32:24 entity 37:18 38:5, 69:5,8,10,15 68:21 69:6 76:6 73:22 74:18 7 **explain** 7:6 10:1 78:8 14:2 35:6 **Equalization** examples 44:8 **duly** 7:12 23:4 24:16 46:16 53:3,7 60:20,23 explaining 23:6 duties 11:22,25 40:14 75:20 equipment 6:7 exclude 22:18 8:6,8,13,18,21 23:19,22 40:13 express 27:15 Ε 9:1,3,13,15 10:16, 51:13 70:16 23 12:1,4,11,22 excluded 41:3 expressly 10:20 13:5,13,22 16:6 e-mails 39:19 42:17 44:24 49:9 17:19 18:3,15 **extent** 57:20 55:12 57:17 58:24 earlier 63:3 79:16 19:23 21:13,20 66:14 67:25 69:20 62:15 78:20 24:21 27:10,13 72:9 78:15 79:12 easier 13:10 48:6 31:20,24 46:12,20 excludes 8:15 extra 25:6 67:14 easiest 43:16 51:16 59:6 68:11 21:16 39:20 51:20 76:7 78:3,10 80:2 74:12 80:22 educational F 11:11 equities 72:12 Excluding 80:23 effort 32:5 71:20 erroneous 53:16 exclusion 9:18. fabricated 44:1 25 10:1.18 21:23 employees 17:14 erroneously facilities 27:17 22:8 24:2,19 54:23 74:6 enacted 64:6 27:22 36:20 facility 6:8 8:3,19 error 57:4 44:13,21 60:4 encourage 27:16 13:23 15:19 16:21 78:6 17:13,19 21:9 errors 59:8 end 28:1,4,12 27:9 29:10 48:17, exclusions 74:2 **ESQ** 3:7 ended 15:20 20 50:8,20 61:1 exclusive 51:21 69:9 essentially 46:21 ending 54:6 56:15 64:9 **Excuse** 28:17 fact 24:3 25:13 endoscope 12:13 67:15 77:20 82:4 established exempt 6:8 14:10 44:15,16 16:22,23 57:4 **factor** 61:17 exempted 49:9 endoscopes estimated 54:15, **factors** 61:13 12:6,14 48:1,10, exemption 9:25 19 14,19,21,23 factory 19:15 exemptions 74:2 50:10,12,14 event 45:15 79:12 facts 6:21,23,24 57:16,22 58:23 exercise 64:18 everybody's 59:1 8:11,16 25:1,2 24:17,18 exercises 9:13 61:8 65:19,21 ends 52:10 60:19, 27:11 66:14 67:7 68:4 **evidence** 6:15,17, 21.22 81:24 82:10 19 54:1,3 57:25 exercising 9:7 **engine** 44:10,18 58:19 59:2,8 43:23 49:13 failed 58:19 59:4 68:15 69:25 73:21 62:21 74:6 engine's 44:22 **exhibit** 6:16 15:16 74:17 43:14 54:10 55:7 failure 53:18 58:9. engineers 34:6 **exact** 34:3 56:20 25 59:7 entire 41:25 75:8 examination exhibits 4:4.5 fair 32:1 33:10 76:15 79:18 11:6 46:7 73:25 6:13,14,18 27:1

Index: faithful..inapplicable

faithful 68:5 familiar 11:25	forthcoming 69:24	<b>Google</b> 25:15 37:17	Hofstra 11:13 holding 60:19
21:8	fortunately 23:3	Governor 26:24	hole 14:21
favor 38:5	found 25:16 36:5	36:18,19 <b>Governor's</b> 23:4	Honor 44:5
February 54:9	fourth 58:12		<b>Honors</b> 10:25
FEE 3:10	frankly 71:21	grant 27:23 82:11	15:17
field 34:6	front 43:17	great 7:20 28:5	hospital 29:12
figure 18:24 39:20	<b>FTB</b> 6:13	<b>guess</b> 29:12 75:25	hours 19:9 31:22
41:2	fulfill 53:12	guidance 73:11	housekeepers
figured 22:17	fulfillment 50:2	76:22	26:20
final 63:11	<b>full</b> 79:19	<b>Guide</b> 50:25	hugely 26:10
Finally 53:3 56:14 58:3	function 77:24		hundred 40:8
find 22:11 26:7	functional 77:15	Н	hundreds 25:17
36:3 43:16 69:3	furnished 10:9	hand 7:8	I
finding 68:22	49:22 52:18 53:12 55:24	handful 13:13	
73:8	furnishes 51:3	hanging 12:18	identified 14:9
finds 12:25 53:18	furnishing 49:19	happen 14:16	identify 18:16
fine 47:16 65:10		34:9	ignoring 64:8
finish 11:2	G	happened 23:2	image 13:21
firmly 76:24		happening 39:9	15:18
fit 25:1 27:18	gave 14:13	<b>happy</b> 73:15	imagine 42:15
<b>fix</b> 13:3 19:11 20:6 29:22	<b>Geary</b> 3:5 5:11 18:7,9 30:10,11,	<b>head</b> 17:7	implication 69:23 70:14,15
<b>fixed</b> 59:5	17,21 31:1,11,17 32:3,11,22 33:8,	<b>headquarters</b> 25:25	important 81:22
fixing 36:22	18,25 34:11,18	<b>hear</b> 17:5	importantly 52:4
fleet 37:14	35:14,19 36:7,25 38:4,10,18,20	heard 27:15 63:20	<b>impose</b> 71:25
flexible 12:19	43:13 59:14,15 74:24,25	hearing 5:5,10	72:2
flown 44:11	74.24,25 <b>general</b> 65:18	82:15	<b>imposed</b> 46:11 49:5 53:24 59:9,
focus 28:6 42:8	67:9	<b>held</b> 52:6,9	22
focused 31:9	generally 32:6	helpful 36:5	imposing 15:21
35:12	49:10	<b>high</b> 18:13	imposition 58:5
<b>follow</b> 14:6 62:21 80:21	<b>gift</b> 52:6	<b>hired</b> 35:14	improper 67:3
	give 15:23 18:22	historically 41:14	in-state 8:10
foregoing 53:11	35:23 40:13 63:6 69:1	history 22:11,14,	10:17 59:1 62:1,4 71:5
forget 80:25	giving 31:18	22 28:24 34:18 35:1,7,20 64:6	inapplicable
forgot 67:5	<b>good</b> 36:21 47:19	67:14	51:23 66:17

include 9:7 11:22 instances 33:25 **kind** 13:10 15:23 42:10 43:22 49:12 16:2 17:10 19:13, insurance 11:20 20 20:21 23:6 63:14 intend 71:2 25:3 26:21 35:6 January 56:18 included 29:25 61:19 68:4 69:23 57:6 30:4,5 intended 71:3 77:12 81:6 **Japan** 13:16,18 includes 52:25 Intent 22:24 35:18 kinds 77:16 81:14 16:10,16,18 19:3 including 51:1 intentional 58:6 48:16 knew 70:22 71:21, 53:4 interest 53:24 22 79:23 Jason 3:13 5:17 incorporated 9:9 interesting 26:7 **Jose** 8:3 12:12 44:2 64:20 65:2 L 67:15 13:23 15:5 16:21 incorporating 17:14,17 19:24 interests 6:10 9:15 27:12 64:2 labor 29:18 48:11 21:10 29:10,20 interpret 72:11 34:10 48:17,20 49:20 incorrect 9:4 81:22 50:8,10,20 55:11 **Lambert** 3:3 5:4, indicating 80:5 69:9 79:23 interpretation 8.18.24 6:3.20.25 indication 19:10 67:4 Josh 3:3 5:8 7:4,16 11:1 17:3, 31:12 81:25 7,10 28:2,9,16,19, interpreting 43:8 iudae 5:4,9,10,11, 22 30:9 38:20,24 indicative 70:19 18,24 6:3,17,19, interpretive 41:6 42:18 43:1 20,25 7:4,12,16 inequitable 71:25 42:23 43:2,8 44:6, 45:20,23 46:1,4, 11:1 17:3,7,10 72:7 76:23 7 45:2 24 47:8,12,15 18:7,9 28:2,9,16, 48:5,9 59:11,16, inequity 73:13 interprets 81:23 19,22 30:9,10,11, 19 60:2,15 61:9 17,21 31:1,11,17 information interstate 74:3 62:23 63:14,17 32:3,11,22 33:8, 32:25 36:5 37:17 73:17 74:21 75:1, intestines 13:9 18,25 34:11,18 56:10 67:14 4,12,19,25 76:11 35:14,19 36:7,25 introduce 5:12.20 77:3 78:22.24 informed 39:2 38:4,10,18,20,21, 79:1 82:13 inventory 29:20 22,24 41:6 42:18 inherited 39:24 43:1,13 45:20,23 language 25:4 involve 53:3 initially 16:12 46:1,4,24 47:8,12, 43:11,18 67:16 31:17 35:15 55:8 involved 81:4 15 48:5,9 59:11, large 72:3 14,15,16,18,19 inserted 12:23 involves 8:2 60:2,15 61:9 **latest** 51:17 14:19 62:23 63:14,17 issue 22:16 23:18 law 5:9 6:17,19 inserting 13:18 73:17 74:21,24,25 25:10 39:13 40:3, 7:12 25:1 49:5 75:1,3,4,12,19,25 44:15 9,25 41:1,9,22 50:25 57:24 58:7 76:11 77:3 78:22, 42:22 47:5,7,20 inside 12:24 67:10 24 79:1 82:13 50:6,13,17,24 66:13 **lead** 3:3 5:8 53:11 54:2 57:18 Judges 27:3 inspected 48:21 58:1,21 61:16,21 learn 26:10 68:15 69:5,7,9,14 installation 51:16 K 71:8 73:6,21 learned 22:14 53:4 60:10,12 79:20 82:18 23:1 46:15 installed 23:20 keeping 43:23 **issued** 55:19 lease 26:11,12,18 44:10,18,22 49:2 49:13 51:4,8 55:11 issues 6:6 28:8 leasing 26:11 **Kevin** 3:12 5:14 56:23 58:23 39:25 42:3 **leave** 47:8 key 14:9 35:5 66:8 instance 9:24 items 9:24 80:10 **led** 40:19 60:23

mentioned 36:8, **left** 28:3,4 locating 57:1 makes 9:21 32:25 14 67:2 64:11 66:24 lodge 15:3 leg 22:13 28:24 making 29:1 Michael 3:5 5:11 legal 5:15 37:4,18 lona 11:17 20:20 67:24 70:20 80:5 22:17 30:22 39:18 microphone legislation 23:2 mandatory 17:5,8,11 27:16 36:12 looked 31:5 39:10 29:21,23 miles 17:17 66:23 70:4 74:13 legislative 22:11, manual 72:5 21,23 34:18 35:1, lost 81:18 million 17:1,2,15 manual's 73:11 7,18,20 64:6 37:13,15 76:18 lot 14:5 22:10 67:14 25:15 35:2,6 42:6 manufacture mind 15:18 31:21 legislativeintent. 16:12 40:16.17 louder 6:2 17:4 com 35:16 manufactured **minimus** 71:20 lower 24:16 13:15 44:2 Lehigh 26:14 minor 77:12 lump-sum 48:3 lengthy 35:2 manufacturer 49:18 minutes 7:6,18 48:14 28:3 47:1 63:5,11 letter 36:18 55:19, **luxury** 26:21 manufacturing 25 missing 25:14 37:19 38:1,17 **letters** 23:3 26:23, М moment 15:14 25 36:14 March 54:6 monthly 54:16 market 12:6 level 18:13 machinery 30:14 **months** 25:19 markup 35:8 liability 48:2 machines 30:24 **morning** 47:19 68:22 markups 35:3 made 12:14 35:15 liable 6:12 50:4,23 move 19:15 23:19 51:14,22 74:1 material 40:9 32:5 79:7 42:2,7 75:22 **library** 25:16,23 moved 16:24 26:3 main 80:11 materials 49:19. 17:16 21 50:17,20 lieu 34:3 maintain 49:20 54:14,24 mover 36:11 **light** 13:6,7,13 maintenance 6:7 matter 2:5 65:7 moving 28:11 8:25 10:5,7 15:9 limited 54:6 55:17 16:5,9 18:2,14 means 80:23 multiply 42:1 lines 68:24,25 20:11 29:14,16, measure 41:23 21,24 31:6 40:23 list 55:21 74:15 42:6 47:21 54:20 Ν 45:3,6 47:21 48:3, listed 54:17 74:3. 12,18 49:18 50:11 measures 39:9 14 52:18 53:2,8,13 necessarily medical 8:23 54:15,21 55:6,22 10:21 35:9 **listing** 56:19 56:20 57:2 58:20 12:1,4,10,11,15 needing 66:25 lists 74:16 48:15,22 50:6 60:5,24 61:6 62:10,13 74:8,19 negligence 6:12 Members 3:5 livestream 6:4 77:24 47:24 58:3,6,9 LLC 22:24 35:18 memo 40:13 59:2,8,9,22 61:11, major 19:14 34:8, 56:17 57:6 18 71:7,9 72:21 loaner 59:6 9 40:2 73:8 75:7,14 76:9, memos 23:3 **lobbying** 38:4,5 **make** 13:10 17:3 15,19,20 26:23,25 35:6 18:5 33:14 35:24 located 17:13 negligent 72:12 mention 36:1 52:24 53:18 56:1 48:15,24 76:8 77:1 55:16 67:5 80:25 62:1 63:21 65:17 67:23 70:1 82:1

Index: Newberry..percent

Newberry 37:9 ongoing 41:19 48:11,13,16,19,22 Ρ 49:2,3,19,21 50:5, non-california operating 24:14 7,13,17,19,24 6:6 17:23 39:4 operations 24:1 51:3,4,13,15,19, pack 31:20 41:12 69:13.16.22 22 52:17 53:7,11 70:8,10 75:9,15 operative 77:20 package 19:6 54:14,16,20,24 76:1 opinion 82:18 55:5,11,15,17,21, **pages** 35:7,12 non-taxation 23 56:7,9,23 57:2, 54:10 55:7 56:20 opportunity 73:4 10,13,16 58:15, 28:11,18,20 paid 16:18 21:12, 17,20,23 59:1 nonreporting 19 30:13,23 60:11 62:10 66:9, opposed 61:21 39:3 41:11 13 68:11 69:8,12, panel 3:3,5 27:22 **optional** 6:7 8:25 13,14,16 70:2,9, Nos 6:16 59:12 63:9 68:1 10:5,7 15:9 16:5,9 20 71:15,17 72:13 72:10 73:5,11 **Notice** 59:21 18:2.14 20:11 76:6,16 77:1 78:8, 74:22 79:8 82:9, 29:14,16 30:1,5 number 5:6 12:23 14,16 80:1,23 11 31:6 40:23 45:6 13:5 14:3,4 16:2 party 74:23 47:21 48:3 49:18 papers 55:4 57:15 18:22 23:11 24:7, 50:2,11 52:18 74:18 81:2 pass 12:24 24:19 12 26:12 36:8 53:1,8,13 54:15, 39:9 paraphrasing **passed** 24:22 21 55:6,21 57:2, 24:18 36:12 numbers 14:11 11,14 58:20 60:5, 24 61:6 62:10,13 Parker 3:13 5:17 past 39:16 74:8,19 77:24 0 parlayed 76:14 paths 40:19 **oral** 5:5 parrots 43:20 pay 22:3 31:2,14 objections 6:15 **order** 69:1 46:18 50:1 71:14, part 8:20,21 14:9, obligations original 31:2 22,23 11 15:9 19:2 24:3 53:13 26:7 31:7 32:7,8, paying 42:12 **OTA** 2:6 occurs 60:10 13 33:1,5,11,14, 49:24 72:13 out-of-state 8:8. 19,20,22 34:3 offered 48:3 payment 53:19 13,16,19,22,23 44:7,15,24 45:18 9:3,13 10:19,23 Office 2:1 5:5 47:4 51:8 52:2 **payroll** 17:1,15 17:20 19:23,25 23:5 53:4 58:5 60:25 pays 34:14 23:16,22 24:21 64:3,19 76:12 Ohio 20:6,8 27:10 30:15,24 80:17,18 81:5,6, penalize 24:20 34:16 42:16 11,13,17 82:2,3 **Olympus** 2:6 5:6, 46:12,19 50:9 penalties 6:10 22,23 8:2,3,20 parties 82:16 51:9 53:10 57:22 9:12 10:15 12:4,5 penalty 6:12 58:24 60:11 68:11 parts 6:6 8:3,5,7, 13:16,22 16:5,8, 27:25 47:24 53:24 70:21,23 71:4,6, 10,14,18 17:19 10,12,16 9:2,14, 58:3,5 59:9,22 12 72:4,14 74:15 20:10 21:12,19,25 22 10:8,10,12,15, 61:11 71:8,9,25 77:2 80:2,6 16,22 13:18 14:3, 22:3 27:9 29:9,19 72:2,6,21 73:12 30:23 33:21 34:1, 4,9 15:20 16:8,11, outcome 45:11 75:7,15 76:10,20, 4,13 41:19 44:14 15,18 21:9,12 46:17 73:7 81:18 21 23:15,19 27:11 46:17 48:14,22 owed 49:10 62:9, Pennsylvania 50:6 64:12 69:2. 29:10,11,13,18, 21 24:11 23 20,22 30:14,23 31:14,23,24 33:1, owned 37:24 67:8 **people** 16:25 26:6 Olympus's 12:1 9 34:1 39:14,21 31:19 21:8 27:23 32:23 **owner** 37:1 40:2,4,5 41:21,24 percent 12:6 on-site 33:13 42:7,10 45:7 **owning** 38:10 17:22,24 18:6,7, 46:11,15,19 47:21

10,11 40:7,8 58:5 17 66:21,24 72:15 41:10 53:25 56:21 42:17 43:24 44:3 77:12 79:1 82:6 57:5 58:13 49:7,11,14,17,20, percentage 57:4 23 50:1,2,21,22 **points** 39:11 79:8 previously 51:25 perform 16:9 51:10 52:10,15, 58:17 61:14.20 polyp 12:25 21,24 53:1 58:18 performance 62:2,4 61:6 64:3,12,19, **polyps** 13:11 55:15 price 49:25 21 67:19 performed 10:6 porters 26:19 property's 51:5 pricing 11:21 49:18 64:17 70:23 **portion** 55:2,3 65:1 primarily 12:5,11 period 30:17 56:16 71:10,11 provide 35:19 41:25 48:2 54:5 72:6 73:12 76:9, **primary** 36:11 54:13 57:9 56:14 58:21 79:18 21 principles 65:14 provided 27:21 periods 76:18 **position** 7:6 8:12 67:17 34:20 48:11 54:10 11:19 39:2,5 56:8 60:20 68:8 permitted 65:13 prior 8:5 31:5 36:2 40:20 44:5 60:4 69:19 47:23 53:17 68:8 provision 27:25 65:20 66:12,17 **problem** 13:3,4 45:5 67:20 person 38:4 69:7,17 71:24 72:10,19 73:10 49:10 52:20,21 15:2,7 18:17,18, prudent 58:10 53:23,25 58:10 76:1 78:7 79:13 24 33:14 48:8 80:7 82:5 **public** 11:13 **person's** 52:10 procedure 13:2 53:18,19 possibility 61:23 15:2 **pull** 13:1 procedures **Pullman** 23:7,17 personal 9:8,10 poster 9:6 44:9 49:6,14 50:22 25:17,25 26:4 12:15 19:18 power 43:23 52:21 64:3 36:7,8,10,22,24, 49:13 64:18 proceed 7:17,19 25 37:3,7,19,22, pertinent 72:20 46:25 47:2 63:10 practice 8:23 25 38:14,15,16 73:3 67:6 proceeding precludes 73:8 physical 53:1 45:12 **pump** 13:9 predates 73:1 pick 17:8 proceedings **purchase** 49:2,25 prehearing 6:5 2:15 82:21 51:4 58:25 66:9 picks 6:3 presence 19:10 **process** 13:19 purchased 8:25 piece 20:20,21 23:21 24:5 15:7,23 18:23 9:1 16:18 19:3 44:15 46:3 22:1,4 33:9,12 48:13,22 49:7 present 79:2 80:16,17 pieces 13:5,13, 50:5 66:13 14,15 20:15 presentation 4:8 processed 44:1 purchases 49:23 7:5,18,23 11:3 **place** 76:4 59:4,5 28:13 47:1,4,18 produced 56:3 **places** 19:14 59:10 63:2.15 **pure** 72:12 product 16:3 68:3 73:14 46:19 65:2 **plans** 57:3 **purely** 35:23 presented 36:1 plastic 14:22 productive 26:10 **purpose** 9:8,14 61:8 62:11,14,17, 20:21 22:14 24:23 20 68:5 products 15:19 27:12,15,19,20 plausible 71:2 16:12 29:22 president 11:20 33:5 43:24 44:1 prohibit 76:19,20 play 78:18 49:14 51:20 53:5 pretty 14:6 19:10 35:1 39:19 41:4 64:4,20 65:3,11 played 20:17 21:6 proper 8:9 78:16 80:19 prevails 10:21 point 8:15 9:18 properly 68:21 purposes 5:9 15:14 39:17 41:5 previous 39:6 property 9:8,10 45:5 67:9 56:1 61:25 65:16,

**pursuant** 6:7,11 20:11 29:20 48:18 55:14 60:24 61:7

push 23:19

**put** 12:25 14:11 20:22 30:19

## Q

qualified 12:2 qualifies 44:12,21

52:25

question 29:9,19 32:12 33:19 34:11 42:20 45:19 47:3 54:2 58:1 61:12 68:15,19,20 69:20 70:22 72:20 75:5 77:4 82:2

## questioning 39:13

**questions** 10:25 11:2 28:18 29:3,5 30:10 38:19,21, 22,25 59:13,14, 17,20 62:25 63:10 72:18 73:15 74:23,24,25 75:2,

quickly 18:4

## R

**R&tc** 6:9,11

rail 23:9 44:19

railroad 24:11,12 26:14 81:4,5

Railroad's 24:9

railroads 23:12 24:8,12 26:6,12, 18

raise 7:8

raised 22:16 23:18 25:11 61:16 raising 66:20

rambling 15:14

rate 42:1

re-sale 49:24

reach 28:8

**read** 40:15 65:12 73:24 82:10

Reading 24:9

reads 64:15

ready 7:17 19:6

real 35:5

reason 15:17 23:23 24:2 26:8 27:21 32:17 39:3 66:19 71:2 81:12, 21

**reasonable** 53:19 58:10

**reasons** 71:14,19 73:1

**Reaudit** 54:9 55:2 56:15 58:13 59:3

rebut 66:6

rebuttal 73:16

recall 42:24

receive 19:9

received 4:4,5 6:16,18

recently 16:24 17:16

recommendation 33:1

**record** 5:4,13 6:15,23 82:19

records 15:12 26:2,4 31:8 54:6, 7,14 57:1,7,10 70:4

RECROSS 4:13

Redding 24:11

**REDIRECT** 4:13 46:7

refer 36:24 38:14 40:21

reference 35:15

referenced 26:22

referred 30:18

**reg** 43:17,19,23 44:6 45:16 78:11 81:2

regard 45:1 49:21 60:17,18 62:7 74:18

regarded 10:8,11, 15 50:16 51:2 52:13,17

regulation 10:3, 4,5,13 42:23 43:3, 8 45:1,2 49:22 50:18 52:12,14, 16,19,23 53:3 55:14 61:12 68:6, 7,23 69:2 77:7 78:3,4 80:10

regulations 58:8

reimbursement 49:25

reiterate 73:19 80:14

related 31:2,24 48:15 54:14 55:6 56:9 57:7 71:10, 12

relates 72:3

relating 57:1,10

relevant 43:5 45:10 68:4 77:23

reliance 53:20

relied 53:16

relief 6:10 27:25 47:23,24 54:1 56:12 57:18,23,24 58:2 62:8 67:20, 21 68:2,22 69:1, 18

relies 10:3

relieved 53:23

rely 46:17 67:13

relying 73:7

**remarks** 63:4,11 73:18

remove 19:1

removes 8:20

removing 80:17

repair 6:6,8 8:2,3, 6,8,10,12,15,19, 24 9:2,14,22 10:6, 20,22 12:1 13:17 14:25 15:5,23 16:8,11,14,21 17:19 19:24,25 20:11,12 21:9,12, 19 22:1,4 23:14, 25 27:9,11,17 29:9,20 30:14,24 33:2,11,14,21 34:4,15 37:2,19 38:3,17 44:24 46:11,18,19 48:17,20 49:17,20 50:6,7,20 52:2 53:4,11 57:16 58:18 59:1 60:24 61:1 62:10 63:23 64:2,8,9,17,19,21 68:10 69:8,11,12, 14,16 70:9,20 71:15,17 72:13 76:6,16 77:1,12, 18,25 78:8,13,16 80:1,16,18,23 81:6,11,13,23,25 82:2,3

repaired 10:17 12:12 15:19 18:3, 15 20:15 48:21,23 50:12,13 57:21 78:16 81:5

**repairer** 10:8,11, 14 48:1 49:23 51:2 52:17 53:1

61:3 65:9,12 78:1, representing retail 52:22 66:10,15 67:9 5:22 8:2 70:5,6,7,13,15,17, retailer 47:25 19 71:1,3,4 73:25 **repairer's** 51:3,10 reprinted 24:24 49:7 74:1,3,6,7,11 60:25 reproduce 43:18 retaining 43:23 79:11,21,24 80:5, repairing 21:13, 49:13 reproduced 9:6 20 24:8,20 33:9 44:9 return 18:19 33:1, sample 54:2 36:23 42:16 67:1 16 37:8,9 53:19 San 8:3 12:12 request 57:7 repairman 66:13 returned 33:11,20 13:23 15:5 16:21 requested 55:20 17:13,17 19:24 repairman's 66:9 56:7 returning 34:3 21:10 29:10,20 repairs 9:12 34:10 48:17.20 requesting 25:22 **returns** 33:22 13:22 14:17,20 50:8,10,20 55:11 53:25 56:19 49:4 16:6 17:22 27:10, 69:8 79:23 20 31:25 33:21 **Rev** 22:11 require 68:9 **Sarah** 2:19 34:7,8,9 37:21,22 requirement revenue 9:4 38:7 48:12 64:6 satisfied 65:5 68:18 37:11,15 58:4 69:16 70:2,9,21, 68:18 23 71:4,5,10,12, requires 73:21 reviewed 34:23 18 72:4,14 77:11, satisfies 69:17 70:4 resale 42:4 15,16 78:2,9 save 11:2 28:1 Richmond 23:14 80:21 research 22:19, 37:20 scenarios 45:8 25 25:12,13 26:5 repeated 35:2 34:19,24 Ridenour 3:5 schedule 14:6 replace 14:16,23 5:11 38:21,22 54:8.17.18 55:4.9 reserve 73:16 19:2 23:15 59:16,18 75:1,3 56:2,7,8,17,22 resolve 28:7 replacement 57:9 62:12 74:9 Ringwood 16:23 13:18 20:20 resolved 80:12 schedules 56:3,6 ROBERT 4:14 replaces 8:20 62:13 7:10 respect 54:5 63:21 71:16,17 replacing 14:25 **scheme** 41:22 roughly 17:24 72:1,13,21 73:9 80:17 76:17 79:18 **scope** 12:17 15:2 77:1 78:9 report 35:19 49:2, 18:19,24 19:1 rounded 20:21 respected 67:10 25 54:9 55:2,8 20:5 **RPR** 2:19 56:16,22 58:19,25 respective 49:3 **scopes** 14:13 59:3,4 62:5 68:19 **RTC** 61:7 58:13 19:20 71:14 74:7 rules 58:7 respond 28:11 Scott 3:12 5:16 reported 2:19 47:9 63:7,12 60:16 run 23:9 68:21 70:5 73:25 Respondent 3:10 75:21 76:3,7 **screen** 12:17 79:10 13:21 response 31:11 S 67:2 reporter 2:20 **scroll** 13:25 Sacramento 2:16 12:9 53:21 result 11:25 56:12 **section** 6:9,11 9:5 5:1 57:3 67:21 69:5, reports 58:13 31:3 47:23 51:12, 15 78:4 79:9.24 sale 29:25 30:4 20 57:19,23 58:2, 52:13,21,22 4 62:8 68:8 resulted 38:6 representative sales 11:22 16:17 13:22 36:17 sections 35:10 results 46:9 67:22 21:8 22:3 48:10 68:13 representatives **sell** 12:4 16:5 49:3 52:14,22 5:19 29:9,11,13 40:24

Index: send..steered

send 15:5,6 20:4 **shop** 23:14 **sleeper** 23:9,13 **staff** 25:21 26:19 31:20 32:6,13 24:9 26:11,17 34:19 39:10 short 20:16 39:20 34:2 37:6,10,11,23 standard 57:23 Shorthand 2:20 38:16 sending 32:10 **started** 39:13,23 **slide** 14:1 44:16 **show** 14:20 15:22 41:7 20:13 54:18 57:9 sends 8:21 19:23 slides 14:9 **Stat** 43:20 **showed** 26:16 **sense** 19:13 **slow** 48:6 31:18 state 2:2,21 3:10 sentence 66:8 slower 17:6 8:5 9:10,11,16,17 showing 15:17 11:8 21:24 24:6, separate 67:10, 16:1 55:4 **small** 34:5 72:2 21 26:23 27:13,14 11,12 **shows** 37:10 smaller 12:24 43:25 44:1,3,4,11, separated 74:7 58:19 59:3 62:16 12,16,17,20,23 Smith 3:12 4:11 68:20 49:8,11,15,16 separating 74:11 5:14 28:10,17,21 51:14,18,21,22 **sic** 6:13 10:21 29:2,4,8 30:8 September 2:18 52:3,8,11 53:4,5 45:24 46:25 47:3, 5:1,7 48:2 significance 56:23 60:10,21 11,14,16,19 48:5, 61:1,2 64:4,13,14, 77:17 service 15:3 8,10 53:22 59:11 22,23,25 65:4,6,7, 18:21 32:9,18,23 Silverstein 3:7 60:1 61:25 62:23 11,19 70:5,6 75:11 38:2,3 55:16 4:10,20,21 5:21 77:21,22 78:17 6:22,24 7:17,20, snare 12:25 13:1 80:20 81:9 session 36:2 24 8:1 11:4,7 statement 6:21 sets 19:20 13:20 15:15 16:4 **sold** 53:12 17:12,18 18:10,12 55:10 62:7 68:10, sole 23:23 setting 23:25 20:13,18 21:7 12 70:3,16 **shaft** 16:1 27:5 28:5,15 solely 9:11,17 statements 28:23 42:21,25 43:10,15 27:14 43:25 44:4, **share** 20:25 **states** 10:19 45:20,22,25 46:2, 12,20 49:16 56:4 47:10 51:1,7 52:1 5,8,22 63:1,12,16, 64:23 65:4,11 **sheet** 37:12,13,24 20 75:13,18,24 solvents 22:1 **stating** 39:2 42:23 **Sheriene** 3:5 5:11 76:5,13 77:19 75:17 77:7 78:23,24,25 79:7 sort 68:10 shining 13:7 **statue** 67:18 82:13.17 sounds 43:7 ship 18:22 19:7 Silverstein's 7:4 statute 8:15 9:6, 20:6,7 23:12,15 source 13:6,13 18 10:2,4,20,21 32:20 33:7 similar 44:14,24 22:15 24:24 27:8, speak 5:25 6:2 58:11 shipment 50:14 16,18,22 28:6 17:4,11 52:3,7,11 60:13, similarly 60:18 30:18 31:15 44:7 special 81:6 21 77:21 45:15 49:9 64:8,9, **simple** 8:17 9:19 15,16 65:8,12,13 shipped 16:16 specific 61:21 67:3,4,16 68:23 simply 51:8 56:7 19:24 23:21 24:5 68:7 69:2 72:15 76:19, 38:11 48:19,23 **site** 34:6 specifically 10:3 20 78:15 80:22 50:10 51:5,9 36:14,24 45:4 situation 24:4 82:10 55:11,17 56:24 48:13 49:9 51:25 77:8 57:17 60:11,25 statutory 65:14 52:1,20 54:12 61:3 64:13 67:17 sizable 17:2 55:10,13,20 70:12 37:14,15 80:4 shipping 64:4 stays 21:23 78:16 80:19 **size** 16:22 spend 25:15 steered 12:19 **ships** 8:18 **skip** 11:9 **spent** 25:22

Index: stenographer..told

stenographer supported 51:24 15,16 67:9 68:12 testify 10:24 11:1 48:7 52:5 69:6,12,15 70:2,9, 12:2 20 71:3,14 72:3, **step** 25:6 33:6 supposed 32:20 testifying 7:1 13,24 74:7 76:3,5, 41:2 79:17 33:15 82:17 6,16 77:1 78:1,6, **steps** 64:1 surely 73:7 8,11,21 79:21 testimony 7:19 80:1,24 82:2 28:23,25 31:1,13, sterilize 19:17 surprising 8:14 18 34:13 36:9 taxability 39:14 **stock** 34:1 swear 7:5,7 46:3 taxable 9:22,24 storage 43:22 **sworn** 7:12 testing 19:4 10:10,17 45:8 49:6,7,12 50:22 51:13 52:25 thing 13:11 67:5 symptoms 32:24 55:25 62:18 69:9, stored 29:10,20 **Systems** 48:15 things 27:24 35:6 14 72:17 74:16 48:16 50:7 60:25 41:22 61:6 80:10 Т thinking 25:19 Taxation 58:4 **storing** 49:10 thought 23:24 taxed 8:5 14:12 Street 2:16 tad 48:6 35:22 31:5 39:15 41:15 strong 59:2 65:25 tailored 12:14 46:15 69:11 72:16 throwing 26:2 76:2 stronger 66:2 taking 41:1 tickets 42:4 taxes 53:23 struggled 9:19 talking 17:11 tie 14:12 30:18 36:20 taxing 39:16 40:3 Subdivision time 5:7 7:24 13:3 43:12 50:18 52:19 talks 44:10 taxpayer 11:15 23:5 24:15 25:16 68:24 53:6,10 60:22 28:4,14 30:17 tangible 9:8,9 61:4,14,15 65:9 subject 9:3 53:14 38:23 39:6,19 49:6.14 50:22 79:10 81:10,11,18 42:5 60:13 61:22 54:25 59:5 61:7 52:21 64:3,19,21 68:11 72:23 82:2 62:25 63:3 65:21 taxpayer's 72:1 target 19:8 66:21 69:5 71:20 **submit** 55:21 82:11 73:4 74:23 78:12 tax 2:1 3:10 5:5 taxpayersubmitted 6:21 6:9,10 8:7,9,12,16 timely 53:18 55:1 56:15 repairer 66:25 9:3,4,5,25 10:13, times 36:8 40:6 14,18,21 11:20,23 technically 81:16 subsequent 62:4 15:21 16:17 21:8. 51:21 53:5,9,10 telling 24:17,18 12,18,19 22:3,12 tiny 41:22 62:22 79:15 23:19,24 24:17 tells 45:13 title 16:14 subsequently 30:13.23 31:2.14 ten 40:6 43:24 49:15 34:14 37:8,9 **Tobin** 3:8 4:14 39:21,25 40:5,6,8 substance 35:5 term 49:12 5:23.25 6:2 7:1.3. 41:11,23 42:1,7, 5,10,15 10:24 terms 61:18 68:5 sufficient 68:21 12 45:9,13,14,18 11:8,10 17:3 69:18 80:21 46:11,18 48:14 suggestion 28:23 29:2 30:12 49:4,5,10,24,25 39:1 41:6 42:19 terribly 42:2 22:20 50:1,4,6,23,25 46:9 82:17 sum 80:11 82:9 territory 24:10 51:3,9 52:14,22 today 5:10,22 53:14 54:20,25 summarize 27:6 terse 65:19 7:25 8:2 12:2 55:5,12 56:23 17:14 31:19 47:20 supplies 59:6 test 33:14 57:17,18,24 58:2, 14,17,19,25 59:5 **Tokyo** 48:16 support 51:1 testified 7:13 60:9,12,22 61:7 67:18 82:7 30:12 46:9 67:6 told 25:20 40:12 62:9,21 66:8,10,

i16 Index: top..Youtube

62:9 **tube** 12:18,19,23 weak 65:18 ٧ 14:18 what'd 14:15 top 12:20 68:25 tubes 12:24 13:7 top-right 14:7 whatsoever **Valley** 26:14 16:2 51:23 total 55:21 74:1 **variety** 12:13 Tuesday 2:18 5:1 where'd 25:7 touching 75:13 Verification 54:7. **Tuman** 2:19 wins 10:4 12,18 55:3,9,13 tower 12:22 31:24 turn 17:7 45:24 56:17,22,25 57:8 32:5 wondering 39:1 59:12 63:1 74:22 73:24 43:1 tower-worth turnaround versus 17:23 words 43:20 31:20 39:20 75:16 77:16 64:15 65:13 67:17 track 15:11 turning 49:5 Vice 11:20 work 10:6 11:15 tracks 81:7,14 53:15 58:3 22:10 30:13 39:10 video 14:17 15:22 turns 26:5 train 23:8 36:22, 49:17 55:4 57:15 18:17 20:14,17,25 64:10 74:17 23 81:7,17,19 21:4,6 type 15:18 30:1 worked 11:17 trains 23:10 81:10 77:18 videos 31:19,23 33:8 77:10 80:16 **types** 14:13 working 16:25 transaction 52:14 62:17 66:11 77:10,14 81:7 33:15 39:23 viewed 67:11 68:19,20 typically 14:15 works 33:23 vision 31:19 transactions 15:1 49:17 visual 13:11 56:4 62:14,15,20 worldwide 12:5 72:23 73:9 74:8, volume 35:11 U 79:22 13,14,15,16,18 writing 54:24 78:20 ultimately 55:11 W transcribe 48:9 written 27:19,20 56:24 57:16 69:11 53:16,20 54:1,3 TRANSCRIPT **wait** 47:7 understand 9:20 57:25 65:22 68:8, 2:15 22:10,11 36:10 walks 32:23 14,17 73:21 74:17 transfer 11:21 80:8,9 82:18 understanding **wanted** 22:19 32:22 38:6 65:21 23:24 25:12,14 transitory 19:10 wrong 19:5 42:11 72:17,23 40:8 46:22 63:2,3 23:21 24:5 66:1 79:2,3 understood Υ transport 65:3,6 79:22 wanting 59:20 transported 9:10, 75:6 undertook 34:19 Yamaha 52:6 16 27:13 44:3,19 60:18 warranted 47:22, 64:22 81:8 undisputed 6:21 24 years 11:18 26:6 transporting unit 14:7 40:19 41:20 79:19 warranties 30:3 43:24 49:15 University 11:13 55:24 York 24:12 travel 34:6 unrelated 35:10 warranty 29:22 Youtube 6:4 treatment 21:9 50:2,12 53:8,14 unreported 58:14 54:21 55:6,22 trouble 57:1 urge 73:10 79:8 57:2,11,14 truck 44:19.22 82:11 **Warren** 36:19 true 40:16 water 13:14 **trumps** 78:19