BEFORE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

| IN THE MATTER | OF THE APPEAL (| OF:) | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|-------|----------|
| B. PATEL AND | S. PATEL, |) | CASE | NO. | 20076372 |
| A. | PPELLANTS. |))) | CERTIF | IED C | OPY |
| | |) | | | |

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Sacramento, California

Tuesday, February 21, 2023

Reported by:

Maria Esquivel-Parkinson, CSR No. 10621

Job No.: 40408 OTA(A)

| 1 | BEFORE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
|----|--|
| 2 | OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS |
| 3 | COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF:) |
| 7 | B. PATEL AND S. PATEL,) CASE NO. 20076372 |
| 8 |) APPELLANTS.) |
| 9 |) |
| LO | |
| 11 | |
| L2 | |
| 13 | |
| L4 | |
| 15 | TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at |
| 16 | Office of Tax Appeals, 400 R Street, Sacramento, |
| L7 | California, commencing at 9:39 a.m. and |
| 18 | concluding at 11:05 a.m. on Tuesday, |
| L9 | February 21, 2023, reported by |
| 20 | Maria Esquivel-Parkinson, CSR No. 10621, RPR, |
| 21 | a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for |
| 22 | the State of California. |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| رد | |

| 1 | APPEARANCES: |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | PANEL MEMBERS: |
| 4 | Mike Le, Lead ALJ |
| 5 | Sara Hosey |
| 6 | Josh Lambert |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | FOR THE APPELLANTS: |
| 10 | Andrew Allen, Attorney |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | FOR THE RESPONDENT: |
| 14 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD |
| 15 | P.O. Box 1720, Legal Division Rancho Cordova, California |
| 16 | By: David Hunter, Attorney |
| 17 | Marguerite Mosnier, Attorney |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

| 1 | INDEX | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | EXHIBITS | |
| 4 | (Appellants' Exhibit 1 was received at page 7) | |
| 5 | · • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| 6 | received at page 7) | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | PRESENTATION | |
| 9 | PAGE | |
| 10 | By Mr. Allen 8 | |
| 11 | By Mr. Hunter 32 | |
| 12 | By Ms. Mosnier 42 | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | WITNESS TESTIMONY | |
| 15 | APPELLANTS' | |
| 16 | WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS | |
| 17 | Bhupendra Patel 10 | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | CLOSING STATEMENT | |
| 21 | PAGE | |
| 22 | By Mr. Allen 46 | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

Sacramento, California
Tuesday, February 21, 2023
9:39 a.m.

2.4

ALJ LE: We are now going on the record. We are opening the record in the Appeal of Patel. This matter is being held before the Office of Tax Appeals. The OTA case number is 20076372. Today's date is Tuesday, February 21st, 2023, and the time is 9:39 a.m. This hearing's being held in person in Sacramento, California.

Today's hearing is being heard by a panel of three administrative law judges. My name is Mike Le, and I will be the lead judge. Judge Sara Hosey and Judge Josh Lambert are the other members of this Tax Appeals panel.

All three judges will meet after the hearing and produce a written opinion as equal participants.

Although the lead judge will conduct the hearing, any judge on this panel may ask questions or otherwise participate to ensure we have all the information needed to decide this appeal.

Now for the parties' introductions. For the record, will the parties please state their names and who they represent, starting with Respondent Franchise

1 Tax Board.

2.4

MR. HUNTER: Good morning. Nice to see you as always, Judge Le. My name is David Hunter,

H-u-n-t-e-r, on behalf of Respondent Franchise Tax Board. And to my left.

MS. MOSNIER: Good morning. Marguerite Mosnier, M-o-s-n-i-e-r, for Respondent Franchise Tax Board.

ALJ LE: Thank you. And turning for Appellants.

MR. ALLEN: Yes. My name is Andrew D. Allen, on behalf of my client Bhupendra Patel, who's present.

MS. PATEL: My name is Bhupendra B. Patel.

ALJ LE: Thank you. Let's move on to the issues in this case. So there are two issues in this matter. The first is whether the \$7,998,295 deduction claimed on Appellants' 2013 tax return is business bad debt. The second is whether Respondent correctly denied net operating loss deductions on Appellants' 2014 and 2015 tax returns arising from the business -- from the bad debt deduction.

The parties made some stipulations, as notated in the minutes and orders. Appellant will have B. Patel testify regarding his intent and motive at the time he guaranteed and started paying off the Bank of America loan.

As to the exhibits, there are no objections to each

1 party's exhibits. Appellants' Exhibit 1 is admitted 2. into the record. (Appellants' Exhibit No. 1 received into evidence.) 3 4 ALJ LE: Respondent's exhibits marked A through NN 5 are admitted into the record. (Respondent's Exhibit A through NN received into 6 7 evidence.) ALJ LE: And Respondent's exhibits marked as a 8 complete copy of Exhibit Z and Exhibit OO are also 9 10 admitted into the record. 11 (Respondent's Exhibit Z and Exhibit OO received 12 into evidence.) 13 ALJ LE: This oral hearing will begin with 14 Appellants' opening statement for up to 30 minutes and 15 Appellants' witness testimony for up to 40 minutes. Does anyone have any questions before we begin with 16 17 Appellants' presentation? 18 MR. HUNTER: No, Judge. 19 MR. ALLEN: No, Judge. 20 Thank you. At this time I'm going to go ALJ LE: ahead and swear in Mr. Patel first. And then, 21 22 Mr. Allen, you may begin your opening. 23 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. 2.4 ALJ LE: Mr. Patel, would you raise your right 25 hand.

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. PATEL: I do.

ALJ LE: Thank you.

Mr. Allen, you may proceed with your presentation.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you, Judge.

2.4

2.

PRESENTATION

BY MR. ALLEN, Attorney for Appellant:

This is an unique set of facts in this case.

The audit has been going on, or commenced, in

2015/2016. We've all survived a pandemic in the
interim. And here we are about eight years later
approximately. And most of us, if not all of us, are
new to the case. The panel, of course, has had an
opportunity to review the briefs and the exhibits filed
by the parties. And we have new counsel for Respondent
today representing the FTB. And I'm new to the case as
well in the last year or so.

So the only person here that's lived this case the entire time is Mr. Patel. And he's here today to discuss his case, to provide testimony as to what he lived during this time period which resulted in the business bad debt in 2013.

What we know is the case law on addressing

Section 166(d)(2), which was adopted by the -- in the California Revenue and Taxation Code -- the California Tax and Revenue Code is that it's the dominant motive of the taxpayer at the time they entered into the transaction. Here it's a guarantee. It's a guarantee on a loan, a credit line, for one of his side investments.

2.4

"Side investment" is the term used by Respondent's counsel in their briefs, and that's what -- that's what Signet Solar was to Mr. Patel, it was a side investment. And he had many investments, but his main livelihood is his hotel business. He is in the real estate development and hotel business. And as we're going to learn today and hear more about, this business is -- relies heavily on financing for real estate projects and development projects and for operating his hotel business.

We have unique set of facts in this case. There was some fear in the briefs talking about this is a -potentially a slippery slope: Well, if a taxpayer
could make up his mind that this was a business bad
debt in this case or a nonbusiness bad debt in that
case, on a whim, that they could then dictate the tax
consequences.

But this is a very unique case. We have a

gentleman who's made his entire life by investing in hotel properties and running hotels. We are going to learn that this \$1 million investment in Signet Solar was merely a side investment. It was not his main livelihood, his source of income. And unfortunately, that project did not go well and that company went bankrupt.

So with that, I will turn to taking testimony from Mr. Patel. The intent here is to be informal and have a conversation with Mr. Patel. This is his first time testifying, so I want to make him comfortable as possible so that we can all learn from him.

2.

BHUPENDRA B. PATEL,

having been called as a witness on behalf of the Appellant and previously sworn by the Administrative Law Judge, was examined and testified as follows:

2.4

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ALLEN:

- Q So with that, good morning, Mr. Patel. If you could turn your microphone on. If you would -- and please speak slowly and clearly today.
 - A Sure.
 - Q If you could describe your educational background

briefly for the panel.

A So -- so I came to this country in 1966. I did my master in Mechanical Engineering from Villanova University. It's a suburb of Philadelphia. And then I started to work as a control system engineer, joint venture between the medical industry and IBM. That was a IBM1800 computer, which was a process control. IBM was trying to get online computing systems.

So I work up to '73. And I always have mind to get in the hotel business. And the reason for getting in the hotel business, there was a few early pioneer came from our district in India in the '40s and they settle in San Francisco. They were in valley picking fruits, get some money together. And then they leased a hotel in San Francisco.

And when they come back, they were telling us the story. So I decided to go in the hotel business in 1973.

I took leave of absent from the company and purchased my first property in October 1973, 30 units hotel in Redwood City. I still have that property.

And then I went back to the company, Philadelphia.

And 1974, I decided to, with my family, migrant to

California. I started that business. And as to develop as engineer, I was looking for building the hotel. And to do that, you require the plans and the finance. So I was

working on those things.

And around 1978, I was involved in organizing the first bank, Bay Area Bank, with a group from Atherton area. And we opened the bank in 1979.

- Q If I could interrupt and just --
- A Sure.

2.4

- Q -- ask a few more questions --
- A Sure.
- Q -- briefly. So you were able to -- you said that had family from India that had relocated to San Francisco. What time period was that?
- A That was 1974. My two sister and my brother. And their sibling, 19 of them, came in 1974 to California. They immigrated as a permanent residents. And to support them, I needed to give -- get them gainful employment plus a place to stay. And a motel was ideal way where kid -- everybody can stay. Kids can go to the school. Adult can work in the motels. And they have a place to stay.
- Q And to purchase that first hotel, did you obtain any financing initially for the purchase or subsequently?
- A I think those days hotel used to be treated as a single user. So no bank was financing a hotel -- motel at those days. So it was an owner finance. And I paid 28,000 down payment, saving from my jobs.
 - O And then what was the second -- what was the

second hotel that you purchased and in approximately what year?

2.4

A I think 1975 we purchased the second property, which was 18 units on 2300 El Camino Real in Mountain View. Then we purchased the third property in 1977, which was in Santa Cruz. That was also I think around \$100,000 down payment, and the balance was owner finance. Those days owner finance.

And 1979 I started to build the first motel on El Camino in Mountain View, which was the land I had acquired in 2300 El Camino Real. The first Best Western property I built and opened in 1981.

- Q And did you obtain financing to build that property?
- A Yeah. That one the bank financed. The Bay Area Bank had financed \$500,000. And the balance, I have to put the equity.
 - Q And Bay Area Bank, was that a smaller bank?
- A Yeah. It was a small community bank. We organized in '78/'79, with a \$1 and a half million capitals.
- Q Let's move into talking a little bit about your experience with banking and the importance of banking for obtaining financing. You had mentioned a moment ago Bay Area Bank and that you had somehow become involved with Bay

Area Bank. Can you explain that to the panel, please.

2.4

A Right. So the Bay Area Bank, I was involved organizing initially, \$1 and a half million. I was one of them. I was not, you know, lead investor. Then in '79, the CFO from Bay Area Bank left the Bay Area Bank and he wants to organize a bank in South San Francisco called Liberty Bank. I took \$130,000 worth of the stock in that bank, which was roughly 8 percent of the original capital \$1 and a half million.

So then I started to develop my connection with the financial institute. And then I got involved with the Best Westerns, which is a brand. Finance in the brand too to expand in the business. So I become Best Western member in 1981. My first property, Mountain View Inn, was a Best Western property.

And during that time, I had a connection.

Bank of America was right across my hotel property in Redwood City. So I started to develop contact at the branch level, the manager level. And then subsequently manager introduce to me the district person, and then I went to the private banking group of Bank of America.

Q So you've mentioned Bay Area Bank and Liberty Bank and you were -- you weren't formally employed by these two banks, but you were investor in the bank --

A Right. Right.

| 1 | Q and you brought other investors. You mentioned |
|----|--|
| 2 | you were a lead investor. You brought other investors from |
| 3 | the local community |
| 4 | A Right. |
| 5 | Q and the Bay Area. |
| 6 | A Right. So I was doing like a community work, |
| 7 | property investor, also the depositor. Because bank need a |
| 8 | deposit to expand. So I was heavily involved on that side. |
| 9 | But I was not on the board, just the advisory committee. I |
| 10 | was on advisory committee. |
| 11 | Q Did you ever get involved with any banks where you |
| 12 | did join the board? |
| 13 | A Yes. Then we decided to form Indian Community |
| 14 | Bank. So we started around '87, and we organized in |
| 15 | 1988/'89 time frame. It's called First Indo American Bank. |
| 16 | It was headquartered in San Francisco. And I was on the |
| 17 | board on that bank. |
| 18 | Q And what is that bank still in existence today? |
| 19 | A No. That bank then we sold to Wells Fargo. |
| 20 | Q Around what time period was that? |
| 21 | A I think it probably around about '93, '94. Exit |
| 22 | date I don't know, but I think it was somewhere around |
| 23 | there. |
| 24 | Q And did you have any other roles at any other |

25

banks after that pursuant --

A Then I was --

Q -- to Indo American Bank?

A I was on the bank board and heading the loan committee in '94 -- no, I take it back. I think it was around about 2004, '5. It's Korean bank called Innovative Bank, I-n-n-o-v-a-t-i-v-e, Innovative Bank. They had a branch in Oakland and also branch in Southern California. I was on that bank board for roughly two years. And --

Q And what was your role on the board at Innovative Bank?

A On the board, one time I was heading the loan committee. And the loan committee chair, you have to review the different loan requests. Officer normally find the loan. They will -- they will do the write-up. And then they bring the write-up to the loan committee and loan committee review with a different parameter. That was a five-member committee, and we kind of, you know, review and approve the loan.

Q And in that process, when you're looking at the creditworthiness of potential loan customers, you're looking at their assets and their ability to pay back the loan; is that correct?

A That's true. But also you -- you look at the, you know, the customer past history, how he is doing, whether he is paying I think, you know, in time. Credit and other

things. So that's -- that was important because sometime on the paper it looks good, but in reality there might be some black hole in it.

- Q So you'd look at the full picture of the loan customer before making a determination if they were --
 - A Right.

2.4

- Q -- creditworthy?
- A That's correct.
- Q Let's move, if we could, just to the -- 2006 roughly and the founding of Signet Solar. If you could just briefly describe. It's in the briefs. The panel's probably familiar with Signet Solar somewhat. But if you could just briefly describe how you became involved with Signet Solar.
- A So Signet Solar, we -- there was two other founder. One was Dr. Lahri, Rejeeva Lahri, who is a Ph.D. in photovoltaic from Buffalo in New York City. And in 2006, he was a CTO of the company called Intercell, I-n-t-e-r-c-e-l-l. They were in the chip business.

And a second founder, Dr. Prabhu Goel, who did the master and Ph.D. from Carnegie Mellon. And he was a gold medalist at IIT Kanpur, which is a very prestigious institute in India. IIT is -- probably you might have seen some slot on 60 minutes I think, you know. Is cream of cream to go to IIT.

| 1 | Q And I can provide the spelling of these names |
|----|--|
| 2 | afterward. And they are in the briefs as well. |
| 3 | A Yeah. |
| 4 | Q So that was Mr. Goel. And he was a Ph.D. from |
| 5 | Carnegie Mellon. And how much money did you personally |
| 6 | invest in Signet? |
| 7 | A I invested which |
| 8 | Q Initially |
| 9 | A All founder invested \$1 million each. |
| 10 | Q And where did Signet raise some of its early |
| 11 | funding, apart from the initial |
| 12 | A Other funding came from the, you know, the |
| 13 | investor in community and mostly the, you know, India |
| 14 | regions. No institutions. |
| 15 | Q And the German government gave a grant or made an |
| 16 | investment |
| 17 | A German government give a grant of \$33 million. |
| 18 | Q And who was instrumental in raising funds from the |
| 19 | private investors, approximately \$30 million? |
| 20 | A I was involved in raising almost I think 70, 80 |
| 21 | percent of the fund from the, you know, community. |
| 22 | Q And at some point in 2007, the company needed |
| 23 | further funding; is that right? |
| 24 | A That's right. |
| 25 | Q To cover operating expenses |

1 Operating and also we were expanding the line 2 to -- you know, the manufacturing line. And you obtained a credit line from 3 0 4 Bank of America; is that correct? 5 Α That's right, I think. And who -- did either -- the other co-founders, 6 0 Lahri, L-a-h-r-i, or Goel, G-o-e-l, did they have any 7 relationship with Bank of America to your knowledge? 8 Not to -- not to my knowledge. But I discussed 9 Α 10 with them my relationship with the Bank of America and I 11 took them to Bank of America. And what other options did you have for raising 12 13 money at this time? 14 Α So at that time, to raise the additional capital, 15 either we go to the VC and give up -- venture capitalists and give up part of the company or obtain the financing. 16 17 And the Signet was start-up company. So no bank will lend the money I think you know. I think it was a start-up 18 19 company, infancy stage. The failure is very -- there. 20 So we decided to go to Bank of America. And I 21

took them to Bank of America. And at that time when we started Signet Solar, solar -- photovoltaic was a leading-age technology. Everybody was thinking about global warming and growing these thing. It was a very hot items.

22

23

2.4

So -- and with Dr. Lahri, who had done Ph.D. in this field, and Prabhu Goel my other partner, Dr. Goel, who was also, you know, electrical engineering, did Ph.D. in electrical engineering, they were the two very technical, sharp mind I think you know. So -- and being engineer, I feel that it was -- it was something good we can do, you know.

Q So if we could, we're talking about the -- when you became a guarantor of initially a \$15 million credit line with Bank of America. This was around June/July of 2007. What was your relationship with Bank of America at that time? How much -- what was your approximate loan balance on -- for your hotel business at that time?

A So I think with the Bank of America, I had relationship from '70s, but I think really we started to get the mortgage money, money on the property, and I think I probably have at that time around about \$25 million exposure alone on the hotels from Bank of America at that time.

Q And would these -- approximately, if you can recall, about how many hotels did you own in your portfolio around 2007, roughly?

A I would say maybe at that time probably nine, ten property.

Q And roughly how many employees do you think you

had in the hotels at that time?

2.

2.4

- A At that time we had roughly 225 employee.
- Q And so you took -- your co-founders and you went to Bank of America to obtain a line of credit; is that correct?
 - A Yes, right. Yes, correct.
- Q I want to shift to what's really primarily at issue here is what was your motivation for becoming the guarantor on the Signet line of credit. You -- you'd mentioned that you'd been in the hotel business for many, many years and that you've also mentioned -- it's in your declaration -- that financing is instrumental, it's the lifeblood of your hotel operations; is that correct?
 - A That is correct.
- Q Why -- among other things, you have a million-dollar investment in Signet Solar at the time you take out the -- become a guarantor, basically a lender, for Signet Solar. You have about a million-dollar investment. Did you have any other similar investments at that time?
 - A Yes, I think --
 - Q And pardon -- let me interrupt. Apologies.
- 22 A Yeah, sure.
 - Q My question ultimately is, is this Signet Solar \$1 million investment a major investment of yours at this time.

A No. I think I have a few other investment. And I was looking at to diversification because I was very successful in the hotel business, was doing very good. So I thought to diversify, I should also invest in other field.

Signet was not only my side investment. I -- at that time, I had maybe a four other investment. And that was a magnitude of \$1 million.

I put \$1 million in the CalLife (phonetic) Fund, which was a mortgage-backed security they were working on.

Other million dollar I had invested in infrastructure development Ireo, I-r-e-o.

A third investment was --

- Q And that was a fund? I-r-e-o Fund?
- A Yeah. Yeah, that's a fund.

- Q And you invested about a million dollars?
- A Million dollar. Other million dollar I invested in Dynamic India Fund. That was development in India, but it was secure from Mauritius. So it was not direct investment in India. You put the money in a dollar to Mauritius and Mauritius is goes to India. Okay. It was -- and you get given. It's -- it's very transparent.

Then I had a half a million dollar in another fund called Telesoft, which was a technological fund in the Bay

Area. Another million dollar I had was it's X Ranch

1 (phonetic), which was a real estate development fund in 2. U.S. here. 3 And so Signet was an important investment to you; 0 4 right? 5 Α Yeah. It was -- it was investment. But I think, you know, I had other investment, as I discussed. 6 7 And what was interesting to you about the Signet 0 Solar investment? 8 Signet Solar was -- I was little more involved 9 Α 10 than the other investment because I raised the money. And 11 I think as being engineer, it was in engineering field so I 12 was kind of more involved in this investment than just the 13 other investment. 14 And, of course, you wanted Signet Solar to do 0 15 well; right? 16 Α Yes. Yes. And you wanted Signet to bring -- to succeed 17 0 18 because it would bring you future income from that 19 investment; correct, potentially? 20 Α Yes. 21 0 But the potential liability you took on when you 22 became a quarantor was approximately \$7 million if Signet 23 defaulted; right? But your investment was only a million 2.4 dollars; is that correct?

Kennedy Court Reporters, Inc. 800.231.2682

25

Α

That's right.

Q I'm trying to figure out why would somebody risk \$7 million to protect \$1 million in a start-up company that -- you know, like all start-up companies, they're struggling, but, you know, there's always potential; right? We live in the Silicon Valley. Or he and I live in the Silicon Valley, and there's -- start-up companies are -- I'm not going to say a dime a dozen, but there are many start-up companies where we live.

What was it -- why would you take on this \$7 million potential liability for a \$1 million investment? Was there anything else that was -- we'd call your primary dominant motivation?

A I think the reason was this was technological things. Also, that was feel -- we feel very confident that Signet would succeed. If I take a Signet to Bank of America and if Signet succeed, Bank of America succeed, I succeed, and I think it will give us good credibility, my credibility with the Bank of America.

Q Well, so let me ask. How -- how do you succeed if Bank of America succeeds with the Signet Solar investment?

A Well, I think it's -- I defer -- I took the business to Bank of America, Signet business. So if Signet succeed and the Bank of America, you know, succeeds in getting a return, then I will have additional credibility with the Bank of America, not on top what I was doing in my

1 business.

2.

Q Right.

A That's the way I looked at -- you know, I looked at that this thing is that it will be a win-win for Signet, Bank of America, and for me. Because I think, you know -- I want to expand it. I want to expand the facility with the Bank of America or larger institutions Bank of America or something because the community bank -- what my need was at that time, community bank cannot reach there because their lending limit is 5, \$7 million. Here we're talking about project maybe 20-, \$30 million.

- Q And -- but your primary business at the time, and now as well, and back in 1973 in fact, was the business of real estate development and owning and managing hotels in California; is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q And as characterized by Respondent, your investment in Signet Solar, which is just a mere start-up solar panel company, was your side investment; is that correct?
 - A That's right.
- O You would agree with that characterization?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q And you relied on Mr. Lahri and Goel as the solar panel experts; correct?

A Right. Because that -- that was their -- you know, their field. And they -- they're a master at that.

MR. ALLEN: If we could turn a moment. I plan to reserve some time for rebuttal for later on today. By my calculation, I still have about 16 minutes left. I don't know if that's close.

But I want to talk briefly about this case. You know, the direct evidence comes from Mr. Patel. He is the one who -- he's the only person that can harbor his motivations for doing things. And this case really is -- Section 166(d)(2) defines a nonbusiness debt, by exclusion of course. It is "a debt other than a debt created or acquired (as the case may be) in connection with a trade or business of the taxpayer." The statute 166(d)(2) does not say "the" business. It says "a" business of the taxpayer.

"Or a debt the loss from the worthlessness of which is incurred in the taxpayer's trade or business?"

And we know from the tax case law developed over many, many years that a taxpayer can pursue more than one great -- one trade or business during a tax year. And, in fact, Mr. Patel is one of these individuals that is involved in multiple businesses.

But as the Supreme Court has stated in United States v. Generes, that to determine whether a particular bad loss is proximately related to the

taxpayer's trade or business, we have to look at the taxpayer's dominant motivation for making the loan. And I posit that the dominant motivation here, consistent with Section 166, was he incurred the debt to protect and enhance his business with Bank of America, as he's testified.

2.4

If Signet Solar does well, of course he can earn dividends. He can make -- he can earn income from that investment. There's no doubt about that. But as the record shows, his primary business is the hotel business. And his portfolio is growing and growing, and he's looking at ways to expand his hotel portfolio, and that is by obtaining financing to continue on with projects.

It's a challenging case for everybody I believe, but Respondent has made some assumptions, assumptions that, sure, they're alluring, they're easy to come arrive at, but the assumptions are not based on fact and they're speculative. And I want to just ask Mr. Patel a few questions about those assumptions.

Q (By Mr. Allen) I want to ask if -- I want to ask you if these assumptions are correct or if they're just mere speculation. But -- and I'm referring to a few parts of the Respondent's opening brief. And I quote, "They held a significant equity interest, having invested \$1 million in Signet, and clearly would have wanted to protect and

increase the value of their investment in Signet." And that's at their opening brief, page 13, line 11 through 13.

Do you agree with that assumption, Mr. Patel, that you clearly would have wanted to protect and increase the value of your investment in Signet?

A Yes.

2.4

Q But why would you risk \$7 million of liability to protect this \$1 million?

A Well, that's -- that's -- you know, that's I'm not agreeing because I think for a million dollar I had some other million dollar investment. And a \$7 million loan, we took it because I think we were believing that Signet would succeed with the other two guys' technological knowledge.

And at that time, the technology was new. A German government, I think if they didn't -- if they didn't believe in technology, they would not have given \$33 million subsidy.

So we at that time with the other two founder, myself and other two founder, we thought this is in the right directions. And that's why we took the \$15 million line from Bank of America. I think that was the true case, not just to protect my million dollar. Because I had a few other million-dollar investment in other company, other investment.

Q And another assumption made that's -- by

Respondent is that, "Appellant husband," and I quote, "a successful business person must have believed that Signet had a great deal of investment potential to have contributed one million."

You agree to that, correct?

A Yes.

2.4

Q Of course. And that's at the brief page 13 as well, opening brief. "Appellant husband must have believed," and I quote, "Signet was going to generate enough cash flow to meet it's requirement with BofA."

Do you agree with that?

A Well, I think any business to start, you expect to make money I think you know. You don't expect to, you know, lose. Then the reality may sink in different than what you have expected I think, yeah.

Q And if Signet, who was obligated to make payments on the credit line, if they're paying for the debt and that money is not coming out of your pocket, then if Signet does well, Bank of America does well, and it doesn't cost you anything; is that correct?

A That's true. I think it was -- it was -- Signet was just paying the interest on that line, Bank of America line. Which was like those days 4 percent. So 15 million, 600,000, \$50,000 a month.

MR. ALLEN: With that I'd like -- I have

1 approximately ten minutes remaining from my 2 calculation. If I'm off please let me know, but I'd 3 like to reserve that time. 4 ALJ LE: According to my calculation, yeah, you have ten minutes remaining. So you can add that to 5 your closing and rebuttal. 6 7 MR. ALLEN: Great. Thank you. 8 ALJ LE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Patel, for your testimony. 9 10 MR. PATEL: Thank you. 11 At this time let's go ahead and turn to ALJ LE: 12 Respondent. 13 Respondent, do you have any questions for the witness? 14 15 Thank you, Judge Le. I have no MR. HUNTER: 16 questions for the witness. ALJ LE: 17 Thank you. Now let me turn to the panel 18 to see if they have any questions. 19 Judge Hosey, any questions for the witness? 20 ALJ HOSEY: No questions at this time. Thank you 21 though for your testimony. 2.2 ALJ LE: Thank you, Judge Hosey. 23 Judge Lambert, any questions for the witness? 2.4 ALJ LAMBERT: No questions at this time. Thanks.

ALJ LE: Thank you, Judge Lambert.

1 I do have some questions of my own here. The first 2 one is what is -- what was the value of Appellants' 3 interest in Signet at the time that Appellant 4 guaranteed the Signet line of credit? 5 MR. PATEL: It was -- I think I invested one million dollar in the City's, A round. 6 7 ALJ LE: Okay. So as I understand --MR. PATEL: 8 Yeah. 9 -- in 2006, the -- each founder invested ALJ LE: 10 \$1 million? 11 MR. PATEL: That's right. But one year later, 2007, is when the line 12 ALJ LE: 13 of credit was quaranteed; correct. MR. PATEL: Yes. But I think at that time we 14 15 didn't have another round. So I think we -- you know, 16 the valuation of the company come when you raise 17 another round, then you value the company. But when we 18 put the \$15 million line, we never had a -- you know, 19 another round. So I think the \$15 million line was to 20 help the company I think. ALJ LE: 21 Okay. Thank you. What was your ownership 22 percentage in Signet at the time the guarantee was 23 signed? 2.4 I don't know it, Judge. It may be --MR. PATEL:

may be on a paper, whatever. You know, it may be.

1 don't -- I don't, you know, have a number. ALJ LE: Okay. 3 MR. ALLEN: Would it be helpful, Judge, to refer 4 him to any document? He'd be more than happy to take a 5 look. 6 I don't have any -- I don't have any 7 documents --8 MR. ALLEN: Okay. Yeah. Yeah, yeah. 9 ALJ LE: Yeah. Okay. In that case, that's all the 10 questions that I have at this moment. Let's go ahead and turn to respondent, Franchise Tax Board, for your 11 12 presentation. It looks like you have -- you requested 13 up to 20 minutes. So let's proceed starting at 14 10:17 a.m. Thank you. 15 MR. HUNTER: Thank you, Judge. 16 17 PRESENTATION 18 BY MR. HUNTER, Attorney for Respondent: 19 Again, David Hunter on behalf of Respondent, 20 Franchise Tax Board. As you've heard already and as 21 you know, this case involves an incorrectly reported 2.2 bad debt deduction. And from the outset an important 23 distinction must be made. That is the difference

between a business bad debt and a nonbusiness bad debt.

This is important because, quite frankly, that's what's

2.4

going to turn this case.

2.4

Now, I will repeat what the law is on this. A business bad debt is a debt that is incurred in connection with the taxpayer's trade or business. For example: Loans to clients, suppliers, distributors or employees when you're running a business, credit sales to customers that go bad, or guarantees of a loan that is related to a trade or business.

A nonbusiness bad debt is a debt that is not created or acquired in connection with a taxpayer's trade or business. Also it is not incurred in the taxpayer's trade or business. Maybe later on as a guarantee. In other words, all other bad debts that are not business are nonbusiness. They're excluded.

Business bad debts give rise to ordinary loss treatment, while nonbusiness bad debts give rise to short-term capital loss treatment. And because of the limitation on capital losses, three grand per year or whatever capital losses the taxpayers may report, distinguishing between business and nonbusiness bad debts is critical.

The United States Supreme Court has held that being an investor to pursue personal profit is not a trade or business for tax purposes, and that's a case we cited called Whipple in our brief, W-h-i-p-p-l-e, which found

a motive is related to an investment when the guarantor aims to increase or protect the value of his or her stock in the debtor corporation.

In order to support a business bad debt deduction, the record must clearly demonstrate that the primary reason for making the loan was business rather than investment related. Even a balanced business investment motivation or a significant business motivation is insufficient.

We heard testimony just now that taxpayer made a side investment for personal profit and also an attempt to conflate and bridge it over to financing in other trades or business pursuits. Well, that's not even balanced. And here the law says a balanced business investment motivation is insufficient. Here we have an investment for personal profit. And that law is from, again, the United States Supreme Court. And counsel cited to Generes. We also have another case citation in our brief, the case is O. D. Smith v. Commissioner.

Now, the Treasury Regulation that is on point in this case under these facts is 1.166-9(b) and also (d)(1), (2) and (3). They all focus on the time the taxpayer enters into the guarantee to determine the proximate relationship between the guarantee and the taxpayer's motivation or profit motive.

To determine whether a particular guarantee is proximately related to the taxpayer's trade or business, we measure the taxpayer's dominant motive for becoming a guarantor at the time of entering into the guarantee rather than the date upon which a payment and discharge is made. The case that we cited to on this point is in the brief. It's French v. United States.

2.4

Unless the guarantee itself was a business debt when it was made, it can't be converted into a business debt later on. And I want to bring up that point because we've heard the question raised two or three times, "Why would you ever throw \$7 million behind an investment of \$1 million?"

Well, you could even try to ask that question now, but we're not looking at this transaction now in 2023. We're looking at the transaction at the time the guarantee was made. And Judge Le asked a very good question. That was a million dollars' skin in the game at that point.

So in this case Appellant admittedly testified that he runs a multi-million-dollar hotel business. The assumption was confirmed that off to the side he also invested in a solar panel company along with other investments. The sole purpose of investing in stock is to make a profit.

In 2007, after the company was formed and Appellant received a million shares of preferred stock with a million-dollar investment, the Appellant and two other shareholders, as he testified to and gave us the background, entered into a loan agreement with Bank of America. And the bank extended the company a \$15 million line of credit. Appellant testified that he guaranteed the loan with the other founders.

When the company defaulted on the loan, Appellant had to honor his guarantee. The company eventually filed for bankruptcy in 2012. And in 2013, Appellant filed a proof of claim in the amount of \$7.9 million. And this is the amount that he incorrectly reported as a business bad debt on his 2013 income tax return.

As we've all heard, the law is clear, income tax deductions are a matter of legislative grace. And a taxpayer who claims the deduction bears the burden of proving that he or she squarely falls within the parameters of that deduction that they are entitled to that deduction. That's New Colonial Ice Company is the case, and also a recent OTA precedential decision in the Appeal of Vardell, V-a-r-d-e-l-l.

We've heard testimony this morning, and I want to read into the record a couple of excerpts from Exhibit A, because I think it's beneficial how the

1 Appellant described what happened in terms of his 2 investment, the subsequent guarantee. This is in 3 response to an audit. It's called, "Explanation of the 4 Credit Agreement." Again, it would add light to it. So, "As additional financing, in 2007, Mr. Patel, 5 along with the other two founders, arranged a \$15 6 million line of credit with Bank of America, the 7 proceeds of which flow to Signet to establish and 8 9 maintain its business. Signet's" --10 ALJ LE: I'm sorry. Can I stop you right here? 11 MR. HUNTER: Sorry. Is this an exhibit --12 ALJ LE: 13 MR. HUNTER: Yes, sir, it is. ALJ LE: -- in the record? 14 15 MR. HUNTER: Exhibit A. 16 ALJ LE: Exhibit A? Okay. Thank you. 17 MR. HUNTER: Page 1. 18 "The loan proceeds were used for the operations and 19 capital expenditures of Signet." 20 Now I'm on page 3. "The parties agreed to mutually 21 become personally/severally obligated to pay such 22 obligation by signing the loan agreement. And further, 23 Signet Solar, Inc., has drawn a line of credit to the 2.4 full amount of \$15 million for use as its operating

capital." This is for the company to operate.

25

Now I'm on page 5, top paragraph. "Taxpayer's involvement with Signet flow from his position as the holder of stock, a minor stock interest in the company, and, when the company's financial situation deteriorated, as a loan guarantor." So again, he invested in stock. That was the first move.

2.4

At the bottom of page 5 leading into page 6.

"Taxpayer had a \$1 million" -- "had \$1 million in
equity in Signet compared to the \$16.5 million drawn
down by Signet from the Bank of America line of credit.

Taxpayer expected Signet to perform under the terms of
the debt, and he expected favorable returns on his
equity." Again, profit motive. "Instead, he suffered
a bruising loss."

Finally, the top of page 7 of this exhibit.

"Taxpayer agreed to be a guarantor of the loan in order to facilitate Signet's profitable performance, which would have accrued eventually to his own benefit and profit as a shareholder. Thus the debt was entered into in connection with a transaction entered into for profit." I'll repeat that. "The debt was entered into in connection with a transaction entered into for profit."

I'd also like to refer to a couple of lines in the document that I submitted, that Respondent submitted,

which is Exhibit 00. I'm at page 3, lines 1 through 13. I'm bringing this up because this document was filed in 2013, more contemporaneous with the transaction and the circumstances. This is drafted by counsel for Appellant.

2.4

Background Section. "In order to fund the debtor's ongoing operational expenses" -- and the debtor is Signet, this is a bankruptcy case -- "in July 2007 the founders entered into a loan agreement with Bank of America. Each of the founders was jointly and severally liable for the amounts due thereunder, and the credit limit increased to \$16.5 million." We've heard that. "Thanks to the founders' investments and other contributions to the debtor, the debtor achieved a measure of market acceptance and was able to raise approximately 30 million in equity financing."

Line 13. "Patel sought to stabilize the debtor's liquidity position throughout 2009 personally making a loan of \$950,000 in loan advances to the debtor within the calendar year." Again, "Patel sought to stabilize the debtor's liquidity position." He was protecting his investment. That's a textbook example of a nonbusiness bad debt.

On point is the appeal of Varner, V-a-r-n-e-r, a Board of Equalization case. In Varner, "The taxpayer

made loans and advanced sums of money to businesses he had investments in." Personal investments. Profit motive. "He also made payments on the guarantee he entered into on loans he made to a company that he invested in." Profit motive.

"On his tax return he claimed business bad debt deductions for these payments. Respondent," like in this case, "reclassified these guarantees and advances as nonbusiness bad debts because Appellant," in that case, "failed to establish a proximate relation between the debts and his trade or business. The Board of Equalization took note of Appellant's concession that he gave the guarantee in that case as, quote, part of the venture, end quote, indicating that the guarantee was intended to further the success of his investment and, in turn, assure that the company did not lose money. Thus the losses resulting therefrom are properly classified as nonbusiness bad debts and are deducted only" -- "deductible only as capital losses."

Likewise here, Appellant held stock in the solar panel company as his personal investment held for profit. He testified that he had three or four other personal investments in other companies. Had he been wildly successful, he would have made money, not the bank. If --

ALJ LE: Please try to move your mic a little closer.

MR. HUNTER: Sorry.

2.

2.4

ALJ LE: Thank you.

MR. HUNTER: I don't want to yell. If he would have been wildly successful in embarking on these personal investments, he would have made the profit. He would have made money on his individual tax return, not the bank. "If these investments in Signet or the other personal investments he mentioned, if he took a loss, he would suffer the loss, not the bank. And you can't conflate the two with a personal investment to somehow being related to or somehow incurred in an unrelated hotel business.

The hotel business was not responsible to make payments on his personal guarantee of the solar company's debt. He testified that he was. It protected his personal investment. And there's simply no coming back from that, and that's where it should end.

When you mention financing as the lifeblood of Appellants' hotel business, that makes sense. He does a lot of money with -- a high amount of business in that area. He can also have a personal investment in an unrelated solar panel company and then also have to

be called to the carpet and make good on his guarantee of an investment that he signed. You can have both.

And they are separate.

Again, given -- you know, I thought that I would have questions of the witness on cross. But given his testimony, I would just like to posit that it actually reinforces Respondent's position in this case when he admitted -- or sorry -- conceded that he had a personal investment in Signet Solar along with other pursuits.

And the second issue to the panel, I think it's more of a sub-issue of the first, the determination should be made that this was a nonbusiness bad debt, and, therefore, capital loss treatment is what it's entitled to. And mechanically, the net operating loss is properly disallowed for years '14 and '15. It's just a natural byproduct or consequence of the first determination.

I'm here to answer any questions that you have. Oh, strike that. Co-counsel.

MS. MOSNIER: Thank you.

2.4

2.

22 PRESENTATION

BY MS. MOSNIER, Attorney for Respondent:

And not only do the documents indicate that at the time the guarantee was made that the dominant

motivation was to protect Mr. Patel's investment, but when you look at the other attendant facts at that time, they support that determination.

2.4

Remember, the company was formed, Signet was formed in 2006, and the loan guarantee was executed in 2007, and that's when the money was advanced. The German government had invested \$30 million in the company. The line of credit funds were needed, as Mr. Patel explained in his testimony, to, quote, help the company. It needed operating capital.

It wasn't until 2009 when another country entered the solar panel market that there was a downturn.

So -- for Signet. So there was -- at the time the money was put in, everything, or at least the facts that are in the record, indicates that Signet could be a profitable company.

What the record also indicates is that the motivation to preserve the relationship with Bank of America is related to Mr. Patel's payment as a guarantor. Exhibit J to FTB's opening brief is a November 11th, 2019, response during the protest, a response from the Appellants.

And they say, "The payment was necessary to protect Mr. Patel's sterling credit reputation and access to tens of millions of dollars of financing for his

extensive hotel business." And it said, "He paid" -this is Exhibit J, page 2 -- "because had he not repaid
the loans, it would have destroyed his credit
reputation."

So FTB does not doubt a motivation that had to do with protecting the relationship. It's simply that that motivation surfaced at the time of the payment and not at the time the guarantee was entered into, as required by case law. Thank you.

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

Judge Hosey, any questions?

ALJ HOSEY: No questions. Thank you.

ALJ LE: Thank you.

2.4

Judge Lambert, any questions?

ALJ LAMBERT: I was just wondering -- well, maybe either party can answer, but what kind of corporation is this exactly? Do you know if it's in S corporation or C corporation?

MR. HUNTER: C Corp. Sorry, Judge. But just based on the facts, first we had preferred stock. And then when they had a second round of finance, they had other classes of stock. So it's a C Corp.

ALJ LAMBERT: Okay. Thanks.

MR. ALLEN: I don't have a specific answer. I would tend to agree with counselor here.

2.4

ALJ LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you. And then I just had a question for Appellant and maybe Mr. Patel, but it seemed like there were two other founders, two other shareholders that also agreed to pay off the loan.

And, I mean, it's -- it seems like they were not involved in the hotel business, but their motivation then would have been, you know, to help Signet, I mean, to increase their investment. But even though they weren't in the hotel business, they still agreed to guarantee the loan?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah. Well, I don't know precisely their motivation, but, yes. And I think that there's nothing inconsistent with that, that they could all have different motivations for why to guarantee the loan. But...

MR. PATEL: When we took a \$15 million line, the guarantee was specified myself, Prabhu Goel, and Lahri. So everybody was, I think, you know, was on. And the 15 million was divided 7 and a half -- I mean, 6 and a half, 6 and a half, and \$2 million I think you know.

ALJ LAMBERT: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have for now. Thanks.

ALJ LE: Thank you, Judge Lambert.

It is now Appellant's turn for their closing and rebuttal statements. Mr. Allen, I'll give you up to 15 minutes. You could start at 10:30 a.m. Please proceed. Thank you.

2.4

CLOSING ARGUMENT

BY MR. ALLEN, Attorney for Appellant:

Thank you very much. "Wildly successful," we heard that phrase used, and I think it was in the context if Signet Solar was wildly successful, Mr. Patel would be wildly successful and he would be taking his money to the bank from this investment and would be very happy.

Sure. That's a possibility. But the only fact that we have here that's been -- that really shows wild success is Mr. Patel in his hotel business, his real estate development business. We are looking at a story of an extremely successful immigrant from India who has built a portfolio of hotels over a number of years.

He's employed hundreds of people over these years from I think he said at the time maybe 125 folks -- or, no, 225 people in 2007, 2008, in that time frame. And I think he's mentioned to me it's upwards around 600 people by 2019 pre-COVID. And he's had an extremely successful career with his hotel business. And he attributes that to getting access to financing so that

he can continue to expand his hotel business.

2.4

In 2007 he sat at a unique situation where they could go, Signet Solar, could go and raise more funds from venture capitalists. It's very common in the Silicon Valley. But they'd have to give up equity. So there was some, you know, downside to going to the VCs and asking for money.

And as Mr. Patel testified here today, he thought about this and he thought, well, you know, basically the downside is he loses in this investment. Because of his success in his hotel business, he's in a unique position where he's able to make a series of \$1 million investments. That's not my situation, but Mr. Patel had that situation in 2007 where he could make a series of million-dollar investments.

And so he looked at this and he said, well, if I bring Bank of America basically almost as a partner, right, if Signet Solar does well and Bank of America will obviously do well then as well. They will be paid off the 16 million -- or the increase to \$16.5 million credit line. Signet will continue operations hopefully growing and expanding to multiple countries and bringing more products to the market and increasing the business.

Obviously that's great for Mr. Patel. But that

wasn't his motivation in 2007. He didn't know if this company was going to work. He was an engineer. He enjoyed the process of getting involved in this start-up. But what he knew is if this thing is successful, Bank of America is going to be knocking on his door looking for other opportunities with Mr. Patel and, consequently, he would be able to invest and expand his hotel portfolio.

2.4

There's no doubt that there's multiple motivations here. No one's trying to say that he invested a million dollars like putting a chip down in Las Vegas on black. It wasn't -- it was an important investment to him. But the upside was expanding his hotel business.

Some of the cases cited by Respondent, in particular French v. U.S., it's a different case. The facts are distinguishable. Most of the cases are distinguishable, but that involved a taxpayer that paid a guarantee later on to protect his reputation at that time, not the time of the guarantee.

As I said at the outset, this is a unique set of facts. And I don't think there's any risk of a slippery slope where, oh, well, taxpayers can then just a make a decision after the fact on how they want the treatment. There are going to be very few taxpayers

who are in a situation that have an established business that requires substantial financing where bringing that financier business would create an opportunity down the road. This is a very narrow set of facts.

2.4

If he brings business to Bank of America, if Signet succeeds, all parties win. You know, I'm just using a simple logic. If Bank of America's happy, then the hotel business can expand. That's the simple takeaway from this case. The cases that have covered business bad debt and nonbusiness bad debt, they typically involve a situation where somebody has taken out a loan and now at the time of payment they're thinking, oh, wow, now I have to protect my reputation. If I default on this, I won't get financing. But I haven't seen a single case that's unique like this where by bringing the business to the financier, by bringing the business to Bank of America, that could expand their opportunities. I haven't seen that in the case law.

I will draw your attention to the few cases cited in Appellants' reply brief. In particular the Litwin v. U.S. case. And that involves looking at the size of the risk. And what we have here is he's taking on substantial risk of a potential guarantee of \$7 million. That's a loan to Signet Solar of

\$7 million to chase after a million-dollar initial investment.

2.

2.4

I don't know what the value of the investment was in June or July of 2007. I don't think it appreciated significantly. There's no evidence to show that the valuation of that initial investment had increased substantially at that time. Even if it were 2 million let's just say, it's still, looking at the Litwin case and also the Estate of Allen case cited in our reply brief, you have to look. Does it makes sense that somebody would throw the potential bad money at good money?

And it took me a while to understand this case, of course, but Mr. Patel's this unique person. He's in a unique situation where the actual act of becoming a guarantor had a benefit that was much larger than the potential dividends or income earned from the investment in Signet Solar.

So again, I'd say the only wild success here is Mr. Patel's dedication and hard work to his hotel business and this involvement with banks quickly in the 1970s. He quickly learned that the way that I'm going to continue to build my business is through relationships with banks.

And he was on the board of two banks. And he

learned the process of what -- how do you obtain financing, looking at specific cases of potential loan customers coming to the bank and saying, "I need money to expand my business."

And so he's known -- his basis for making this determination in 2007 was formed on his past experiences. And so he utilized those experiences when he went to -- when he brought Signet Solar and his cofounders to the bank and they agreed to guarantee the loan to the tune of potentially \$7 million, which was all paid off. And his relationship with Bank of America is still pristine today.

Unfortunately, it didn't go the way that he wanted. But at the time of the guarantee, that's what we look at. And at the time of the guarantee, he was hoping this was going to be a win-win for everybody, which would then assist him in expanding his hotel business.

And with that, we'll refer the panel back to our reply brief and our other filings in the case. And I -- again, this is an eight-year-old case. It's been going on for a long time. I think all of the documents referenced in Respondent's presentation were prepared by their CPAs or other representatives.

I'm not saying that there's any reason to doubt those documents, but I don't know that any of those

1 were declarations signed by Mr. Patel. And so I 2 just -- you know, I wonder how important all of those 3 documents are and every specific sentence. But with that, we will submit our case to the panel. 4 5 Thank you for closing and rebuttal. ALJ LE: Let me turn -- again turn to the panel one last time to see 6 if they have any final questions for either party. 7 Judge Hosey, any final questions for either party? 8 9 ALJ HOSEY: No questions. But thank you both for 10 your presentations. Thank you, Judge Hosey. 11 ALJ LE: 12 Judge Lambert, any final questions for either 13 party? 14 ALJ LAMBERT: No final questions. Thanks. 15 Thank you, Judge Lambert. ALJ LE: I do have one question myself. This is for 16 17 Appellant. There was discussed in the briefing \$35,077 18 that Appellant advanced to Signet to pay for insurance 19 and employee compensation. It seems to have implied 20 that that amount was conceded as nonbusiness bad debt, 21 but I just want to confirm that with Appellant. 2.2 MR. ALLEN: 35,000? 23 ALJ LE: Yes. 2.4 MR. ALLEN: Yes. There were certainly some 25 concessions in the briefs. And I think we've narrowed

it to 7.1 million. I apologize, I'm searching. 1 2 would refer you to the Appellants' reply brief, 3 page 11, where -- for the concessions. So there is a 4 portion of this that we're not contesting, correct. 5 ALJ LE: Okay. Thank you very much. 6 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: As of that, I have no further questions. So if there's nothing else, that will 8 9 conclude --10 MR. ALLEN: One last point. Apologies. 11 Yes. Go ahead. ATIJ TE: 12 MR. ALLEN: It's just so say that I think that the parties agree that the impact of the determination on 13 14 2013 then would carry into '14 and '15. I don't think 15 there's any dispute as to that. So I didn't present 16 much argument on that. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. Appreciate it. 18 MR. ALLEN: You're welcome. Thank you. 19 ALJ LE: Okay. So that will conclude our hearing. 20 Thank you, everyone, for coming in today. This case is 21 submitted on February 21st, 2023. The record is now 22 The judges will meet and decide your case closed. 23 later on, and we will send you a written opinion of our

The next hearing for a different appeal will begin

2.4

25

decision within 100 days.

```
1
     at 1:00 p.m. Thank you, everyone. And goodbye.
         MR. HUNTER:
                       Thank you, Judge.
 2
                      Thank you, Judge.
 3
         MR. ALLEN:
           (Conclusion of the proceedings at 10:51 a.m.)
 4
 5
                              ---000---
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

| 1 | REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE |
|----|--|
| 2 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA) |
| 3 | COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO) ss. |
| 4 | I, MARIA ESQUIVEL-PARKINSON, do hereby certify |
| 5 | that I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter, and that at the |
| 6 | times and places shown I recorded verbatim in shorthand |
| 7 | writing all the proceedings in the following described |
| 8 | action completely and correctly to the best of my ability: |
| 9 | LOCATION: OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS |
| 10 | 400 R Street CASE: In the Matter of the Appeal of |
| 11 | B. Patel and S. Patel DATE: Tuesday, February 21, 2023 |
| 12 | I further certify that my said shorthand notes |
| 13 | have been transcribed into typewriting, and that the |
| 14 | foregoing pages 1 through 54 constitute an accurate and |
| 15 | complete transcript of all my shorthand writing for the |
| 16 | dates and matter specified. |
| 17 | I further certify that I have complied with CCP |
| 18 | 237(a)(2) in that all personal juror identifying |
| 19 | information has been redacted if applicable. |
| 20 | IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed this |
| 21 | certificate at Sacramento, California, on this 15th day of |
| 22 | March, 2023. Mairas DV |
| 23 | Maria Esquivel-Parkinson CSR No. 10621, RPR |
| 24 | |

| \$ | 1 | 1988/'89 15:15 | 39:16 |
|--|---|---|--|
| \$1 10:3 13:20 | 1 4:4 7:1,3 37:17 | 1:00 54:1 | 32 4:11 |
| 14:3,9 18:9 21:24 22:8,9 24:2,10 | 39:1 | | 35,000 52:22 |
| 27:24 28:8 31:10 | 1.166-9(b) 34:21 | 2 | 4 |
| 35:13 38:8 47:12 | 10 4:16 | 2 44:2 50:7 | |
| \$100,000 13:6 | 100 53:24 | 20 32:13 | 4 29:23 |
| \$130,000 14:7 | 10621 2:20 | 20- 25:11 | 40 7:15 |
| \$15 20:9 28:20 | 10:17 32:14 | 2004 16:5 | 400 2:16 |
| 31:18,19 36:7 37:6,24 45:18 | 10:30 46:3 | 2006 17:9,18 31:9 | 40s 11:12 |
| \$16.5 38:9 39:12 | 10:51 54:4 | 43:5 | 42 4:12 |
| 47:20 | 11 28:2 53:3 | 2007 18:22 20:11, | 46 4:22 |
| \$2 45:22 | 11:05 2:18 | 22 31:12 36:1 37:5 39:8 43:5 | |
| \$25 20:17 | 11th 43:21 | 46:21 47:2,14 | 5 |
| \$30 18:19 25:11 | 125 46:20 | 48:1 50:4 51:6 | 5 16:5 25:10 38:1,7 |
| 43:7 | 13 28:2 29:7 39:2, | 20076372 2:7 5:8 | |
| \$33 18:17 28:17 | 17 | 2008 46:21 | 6 |
| \$35,077 52:17 | 14 42:15 53:14 | 2009 39:18 43:11 | 6 20.7 45.24 22 |
| \$50,000 29:24 | 15 29:23 42:15 45:21 46:2 53:14 16 26:5 47:20 | 2012 36:11 | 6 38:7 45:21,22 |
| \$500,000 13:16 | | 2013 6:15 8:24 36:11,14 39:3 53:14 | 60 17:24 |
| \$7 23:22 24:2,10 | | | 600 46:22 |
| 25:10 28:7,11 35:12 49:25 50:1 51:10 | 166 27:4 | 2014 6:17 | 600,000 29:24 |
| | 166(d)(2) 9:1 | 2015 6:17 | 7 |
| \$7,998,295 6:14 | 26:11,14 4 730 , 3:45 | 2015 6.17 2015/2016 8:12 | |
| \$7.9 36:12 | 1720 3:15 | | 7 4:4,5 38:15 45:2 ² |
| \$950,000 39:19 | 18 13:4 | 2019 43:21 46:23 | 7.1 53:1 |
| | 19 12:13 | 2023 2:19 5:2,9 35:15 53:21 | 70 18:20 |
| (| 1966 11:2 | 21 2:19 5:2 | 70s 20:15 |
| (2) 34:22 | 1970s 50:22 | 21st 5:9 53:21 | 73 11:9 |
| (3) 34:22 | 1973 11:17,19 25:13 | 225 21:2 46:21 | 78/'79 13:20 |
| (d)(1) 34:22 | 1974 11:22 12:12, | 2300 13:4,11 | 79 14:4 |
| (u)(1) 54.22 | 13 | 28,000 12:23 | |
| - | 1975 13:3 | | 8 |
| | 1977 13:5 | 3 | 8 4:10 14:8 |
| 000 54:5 | 1978 12:2 | 2 07:00 00 4 | 80 18:20 |
| | 1979 12:4 13:9 | 3 37:20 39:1 | 10.20 |

| 87 15:14 | advisory 15:9,10 | American 15:15 | arranged 37:6 |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | affirm 8:1 | 16:2 | arrive 27:16 |
| 9 | afterward 18:2 | amount 36:12,13 37:24 41:23 52:20 | assets 16:21 |
| 93 15:21 | agree 25:22 28:3 29:5,11 45:2 | amounts 39:11 | assist 51:17 |
| 94 15:21 16:4 | 53:13 | Andrew 3:10 6:9 | assumption 28:3,25 35:22 |
| 9:39 2:17 5:3,9 | agreed 37:20 38:16 45:6,11 | Apologies 21:21 53:10 | assumptions 27:15,17,19,21 |
| Α | 51:9 | apologize 53:1 | assure 40:16 |
| A-NN 4:5 | agreeing 28:10 agreement 36:5 | appeal 2:6 5:6,22 36:22 39:24 53:25 | Atherton 12:3 |
| a.m. 2:17,18 5:3,9 | 37:4,22 39:9 | Appeals 2:2,16 | attempt 34:11 |
| 32:14 46:3 54:4 | ahead 7:21 30:11 | 5:7,15 | attendant 43:2 |
| ability 16:21 | 32:10 53:11 | APPEARANCES | attention 49:20 |
| absent 11:18 | aims 34:2 | 3:1 | Attorney 3:10,16 |
| acceptance 39:15 | ALJ 3:4 5:5 6:8,12 7:4,8,13,20,24 8:4 | Appellant 6:21 8:9 10:15 29:1,8 | 17 8:9 32:18 42:23 46:7 |
| access 43:24 46:25 | 30:4,8,11,17,20, 22,24,25 31:7,9, | 31:3 35:20 36:1,3, 7,9,11 37:1 39:5 | attributes 46:25 |
| | 12,21 32:2,6,9 | 40:9,20 45:4 46:7 | audit 8:11 37:3 |
| accrued 38:18 | 37:10,12,14,16 41:1,4 44:10,14, | 52:17,18,21 | |
| achieved 39:14 | 15,17,25 45:3,23, | Appellant's 40:12 46:1 | B |
| acquired 13:10 26:13 33:10 | 25 52:5,9,11,14, 15,23 53:5,11,19 | Appellants 2:8 | back 11:16,21 |
| act 50:15 | Allen 3:10 4:10,22 | 3:9 6:8 43:22 | 16:4,21 25:13 41:19 51:18 |
| actual 50:15 | 6:9 7:19,22,23 8:5,6,9 10:20 26:3 | appellants' 4:4, 15 6:15,17 7:1,3, | background |
| add 30:5 37:4 | 27:20 29:25 30:7 | 14,15,17 31:2 | 10:25 36:5 39:6 |
| additional 19:14 | 32:3,8 45:1,13 46:2,7 50:9 52:22, | 41:22 49:21 53:2 | bad 6:15,18 8:24 9:21,22 26:25 |
| 24:24 37:5 | 24 53:6,10,12,18 54:3 | appreciated 50:4 | 32:22,24 33:3,7,9 |
| addressing 8:25 | | approve 16:18 | 13,15,16,20 34:4 36:14 39:23 40:6, |
| administrative 5:13 10:16 | alluring 27:16 America 6:23 | approximate 20:12 | 9,18 42:12 49:11 |
| admitted 7:1,5,10 42:8 | 14:17,21 19:4,8, 10,11,20,21 | approximately 8:14 13:1 18:19 | 50:11 52:20 balance 13:7,16 20:13 |
| admittedly 35:20 | 20:10,11,14,18 21:4 24:16,18,20, | 20:20 23:22 30:1 39:16 | balanced 34:7,14 |
| adopted 9:1 | 22,23,25 25:5,7 | area 12:3 13:15, | |
| Adult 12:17 | 27:5 28:21 29:19, 22 36:6 37:7 | 18,25 14:1,2,5,22 | bank 6:23 12:3,4, 22 13:15,16,18, |
| advanced 40:1 43:6 52:18 | 38:10 39:10 43:19 47:17,18 48:5 | 15:5 22:25 41:24 argument 46:6 | 19,25 14:1,2,5,6, 7,8,17,21,22,24 |
| advances 39:19 40:8 | 49:6,18 51:12 America's 49:8 | 53:16 arising 6:18 | 15:7,14,15,17,18, 19 16:2,3,5,6,8,10 19:4,8,10,11,17, |

Index: banking..close

20,21 20:10,11, 9,11 32:11,20 41:14,15,22,23 21 33:1,24 34:18, 14,18 21:4 24:16, 39:25 40:11 50:25 44:1 45:8,11 19,21 35:6,20 18,20,22,23,25 46:15,16,24 47:1, 36:21 39:8,25 **Bofa** 29:10 25:5,7,8,9 27:5 11,24 48:14 49:2, 40:8,10,13 42:7 28:21 29:19,22 bottom 38:7 3,6,9,10,17 50:21, 44:9 48:16 49:10, 36:6 37:7 38:10 23 51:4,17 16,19,22 50:8,9, **Box** 3:15 39:10 40:25 41:9, 13 51:19,20 52:4 businesses 11 43:19 46:12 **branch** 14:19 53:20,22 26:22 40:1 47:17,18 48:5 16:7 cases 48:15,17 49:6,8,18 51:3,9, byproduct 42:16 49:10,20 51:2 **brand** 14:12 cash 29:10 **bridge** 34:12 banking 13:23 C 14:21 Certified 2:21 briefing 52:17 calculation 26:5 **CFO** 14:5 bankrupt 10:7 **briefly** 11:1 12:9 30:2,4 17:11,13 26:7 bankruptcy **chair** 16:12 calendar 39:20 36:11 39:8 briefs 8:16 9:9,19 challenging 17:11 18:2 52:25 California 2:1,17, **banks** 14:24 27:14 22 3:14,15 5:1,11 15:11,25 50:21, bring 16:15 23:17, characterization 9:2 11:23 12:13 24,25 18 35:10 47:17 25:22 16:7 25:15 **based** 27:17 bringing 39:2 characterized call 24:11 44:21 47:23 49:3,16,17 25:17 called 10:15 14:6 basically 21:17 **brings** 49:6 **chase** 50:1 15:15 16:5 17:18 47:9.17 brother 12:12 22:24 33:25 37:3 chip 17:19 48:11 **basis** 51:5 42:1 brought 15:1,2 circumstances Bay 12:3 13:15, 51:8 Callife 22:9 39:4 18,24,25 14:2,5, bruising 38:14 **Camino** 13:4,10, 22 15:5 22:24 citation 34:18 11 Buffalo 17:17 bears 36:17 cited 33:24 34:18 capital 14:8 19:14 35:6 48:15 49:20 **build** 13:9,13 **begin** 7:13,16,22 33:17,18,19 50:23 50:9 53:25 37:19,25 40:19 City 11:20 14:18 building 11:24 42:13 43:10 **behalf** 6:4,10 17:17 10:15 32:19 built 13:12 46:18 capitalists 19:15 City's 31:6 47:4 believed 29:2,9 **burden** 36:17 **claim** 36:12 capitals 13:21 believing 28:12 **business** 6:15,18 claimed 6:14 40:6 8:24 9:12,13,14, **career** 46:24 beneficial 36:25 17,21 11:10,11, **claims** 36:17 Carnegie 17:21 benefit 38:18 17,23 14:13 17:19 18:5 50:16 **classes** 44:24 20:13 21:10 22:3 24:22 25:1,12,13 carpet 42:1 Bhupendra 4:16 classified 40:18 26:14,15,17,20 6:10,11 10:14 carry 53:14 **clear** 36:15 27:1,5,10 29:2,12 bit 13:22 32:24 33:3,4,6,8, **case** 2:7 5:8 6:13 client 6:10 11,12,14,15,20,24 8:10,15,18,20,22, **black** 17:3 48:12 34:4,6,7,8,13,14 clients 33:5 25 9:18,22,23,25 **board** 3:14 6:1,5,7 35:3,8,9,21 36:14 26:7,10,13,18 **close** 26:6 15:9,12,17 16:3,8, 37:9 40:6,11 27:14 28:21 32:9,

Index: closed..decision

creditworthiness **closed** 53:22 complete 7:9 converted 35:9 16:20 closer 41:2 computer 11:6 **copy** 7:9 creditworthy closing 4:20 30:6 computing 11:8 Cordova 3:15 17:7 46:1.6 52:5 conceded 42:8 Corp 44:21,24 critical 33:21 Co-counsel 52:20 corporation 34:3 42:19 cross 4:15 42:5 concession 44:18,19,20 co-founders 19:6 40:12 **Cruz** 13:6 correct 16:22 21:3 **CSR** 2:20 concessions 17:8 19:4 21:5,6, **Code** 9:2,3 52:25 53:3 13,14 23:19,24 **CTO** 17:18 25:15,16,20,25 cofounders 51:9 conclude 53:9,19 27:21 29:5,20 customer 16:24 Colonial 36:20 concluding 2:18 31:13 53:4 17:5 comfortable conclusion 54:4 correctly 6:16 customers 16:20 10:11 33:7 51:3 cost 29:19 conduct 5:19 commenced counsel 8:17 9:9 confident 24:14 8:11 D 34:17 39:5 confirm 52:21 commencing counselor 45:2 date 5:8 15:22 confirmed 35:22 2:17 35:5 countries 47:22 Commissioner conflate 34:12 **David** 3:16 6:3 34:19 country 11:2 41:12 32:19 43:11 committee 15:9, connection **days** 12:21,23 COUNTY 2:3 10 16:4,12,15,16, 14:10,16 26:13 13:7 29:23 53:24 17 33:4,10 38:20,22 **couple** 36:24 deal 29:3 common 47:4 consequence 38:24 42:16 **debt** 6:15,19 8:24 Court 26:23 33:22 community 9:22 26:11,12,16 13:19 15:3,6,13 consequences 34:17 53:7,17 27:4 29:17 32:22, 18:13,21 25:8,9 9:24 cover 18:25 24 33:3,9 34:4 companies 24:3, consistent 27:3 35:8,10 36:14 covered 49:10 6,8 40:23 38:12,19,21 39:23 contact 14:18 **CPAS** 51:23 40:6 41:17 42:12 company 10:6 contemporaneo 49:11 52:20 cream 17:24,25 11:18,21 17:18 **us** 39:3 18:22 19:16,17,19 debtor 34:3 39:7, create 49:3 24:2 25:19 28:23 contesting 53:4 14,19 31:16.17.20 35:23 created 26:12 context 46:9 debtor's 39:6,17, 36:1,6,9,10,20 33:10 21 37:25 38:3 40:4, continue 27:13 credibility 24:18, 16,21 41:25 43:4, 47:1,21 50:23 debts 33:13,15, 24 7,10,16 48:2 16,21 40:9,11,18 contributed 29:4 credit 9:6 16:25 company's 38:4 decide 5:22 53:22 contributions 19:3 20:9 21:4,9 41:17 39:14 29:17 31:4,13 decided 11:17,22 compared 38:9 33:6 36:7 37:4,7, 15:13 19:20 **control** 11:5.7 23 38:10 39:12 compensation decision 36:21 43:8,24 44:3 conversation 52:19 48:24 53:24 47:21 10:10

declaration direct 4:15 10:19 downside 47:6, entered 9:4 36:5 22:19 26:8 21:12 38:19,20,21,22 39:9 40:4 43:11 declarations directions 28:20 downturn 43:12 44:8 52:1 disallowed 42:15 dozen 24:7 entering 35:4 dedication 50:20 discharge 35:6 drafted 39:4 **enters** 34:23 deducted 40:19 discuss 8:22 draw 49:20 entire 8:21 10:1 deductible 40:19 discussed 19:9 drawn 37:23 38:9 entitled 36:19 deduction 6:14, 23:6 52:17 due 39:11 42:14 19 32:22 34:4 **dispute** 53:15 36:17,19,20 **equal** 5:18 Dynamic 22:18 distinction 32:23 deductions 6:17 Equalization 36:16 40:7 distinguishable Ε 39:25 40:12 48:17,18 default 49:14 **equity** 13:17 early 11:11 18:10 distinguishing 27:24 38:9,13 defaulted 23:23 39:16 47:5 33:20 earn 27:7,8 36:9 distributors 33:5 Esquivelearned 50:17 defer 24:21 parkinson 2:20 district 11:12 easy 27:16 defines 26:11 14:20 establish 37:8 educational demonstrate 40:10 diversification 10:25 34:5 22:2 established 49:1 eight-year-old denied 6:16 diversify 22:4 **estate** 9:13,15 51:20 deposit 15:8 23:1 25:14 46:16 divided 45:21 **EI** 13:4,9,11 50:9 depositor 15:7 dividends 27:8 electrical 20:3,4 eventually 36:10 describe 10:25 50:17 38:18 embarking 41:6 17:11,13 Division 3:15 **evidence** 7:3,7,12 employed 14:23 destroyed 44:3 document 32:4 26:8 50:5 46:19 deteriorated 38:5 38:25 39:2 **EXAMINATION** employee 21:2 determination documents 32:7 10:19 52:19 17:5 42:11,17 42:24 51:21,25 examined 10:17 employees 20:25 43:3 51:6 53:13 52:3 33:6 excerpts 36:24 determine 26:24 dollar 22:11,17, employment 34:23 35:1 20,23,25 28:10, excluded 33:14 12:15 11,22 31:6 develop 11:23 exclusion 26:11 end 40:14 41:20 14:10.18 **dollars** 22:16 executed 43:5 23:24 43:25 48:11 **engineer** 11:5,24 developed 26:18 exhibit 4:4 7:1,3, 20:5 23:11 48:2 dollars' 35:18 development 6,9,11 36:25 engineering 11:3 9:13,16 22:12,18 dominant 9:3 37:12,15,16 38:15 20:3.4 23:11 23:1 25:14 46:16 24:12 27:2,3 35:3 39:1 43:20 44:2 42:25 enhance 27:5 dictate 9:23 **exhibits** 4:5 6:25 door 48:6 7:1,4,8 8:16 enjoyed 48:3 difference 32:23 doubt 27:9 44:5 existence 15:18 ensure 5:21 dime 24:7 48:9 51:24

Index: Exit..guarantor

Exit 15:21 **family** 11:22 found 33:25 gentleman 10:1 12:10 founder 17:16,20 **expand** 14:13 **German** 18:15,17 15:8 25:6 27:12 **Fargo** 15:19 18:9 28:18,19 28:14 43:6 47:1 48:8 49:9,18 31:9 favorable 38:12 give 12:15 18:17 51:4 founders 36:8 19:15,16 24:17 fear 9:19 expanding 19:1 37:6 39:9,10 45:5 33:15,16 46:2 47:22 48:13 51:17 February 2:19 47:5 founders' 39:13 5:2,9 53:21 **expect** 29:12,13 **global** 19:24 founding 17:10 feel 20:6 24:14 expected 29:15 Goel 17:20 18:4 frame 15:15 46:21 38:11,12 field 20:2 22:5 19:7 20:2 25:24 Franchise 3:14 45:19 23:11 26:2 expenditures 5:25 6:4,7 32:11, 37:19 figure 24:1 gold 17:21 20 expenses 18:25 filed 8:16 36:11,12 **good** 6:2,6 10:21 Francisco 11:13, 39:7 39:3 17:2 20:6 22:3 15 12:10 14:6 24:17 35:17 42:1 experience 13:23 **filings** 51:19 15:16 50:11 frankly 32:25 experiences 51:7 **final** 52:7,8,12,14 goodbye 54:1 experts 25:25 **Finally** 38:15 French 35:7 government 48:16 18:15.17 28:15 explain 14:1 **finance** 11:25 **fruits** 11:13 12:23 13:7,8 43:7 explained 43:9 14:12 44:23 FTB 8:18 44:5 grace 36:16 Explanation 37:3 financed 13:15, FTB's 43:20 **grand** 33:18 exposure 20:18 16 full 17:4 37:24 grant 18:15,17 extended 36:6 financial 14:11 38:4 fund 18:21 22:9. great 26:20 29:3 extensive 44:1 30:7 47:25 14,15,18,23,24 **financier** 49:3,17 extremely 46:17. 23:1 39:6 group 12:3 14:21 23 financing 9:15 funding 18:11,12, growing 19:24 12:20,22 13:13,24 23 19:16 21:12 27:13 27:11 47:22 F 34:12 37:5 39:16 funds 18:18 43:8 guarantee 9:5 41:21 43:25 46:25 47:3 31:22 33:13 facilitate 38:17 49:2,15 51:2 **future** 23:18 34:23,24 35:1,5,8, facility 25:6 17 36:10 37:2 **find** 16:13 40:3,13,14 41:16 fact 25:13 26:21 five-member G 42:1.25 43:5 44:8 27:17 46:13 48:24 16:17 45:12,16,19 **G-O-E-L** 19:7 facts 8:10 9:18 flow 29:10 37:8 48:19,20 49:24 34:21 43:2,14 51:9,14,15 38:2 gainful 12:15 44:22 48:17,22 guaranteed 6:23 focus 34:22 game 35:18 49:5 31:4,13 36:8 folks 46:20 **failed** 40:10 gave 18:15 36:4 guarantees 33:7 40:13 form 15:13 failure 19:19 40:8 generate 29:9 formally 14:23 falls 36:18 guarantor 20:9 Generes 26:24 21:9,17 23:22 formed 36:1 43:4 familiar 17:12 34:18 34:1 35:4 38:5,16 51:6

43:20 50:16 **hot** 19:24 important 17:1 institutions 23:3 32:22,25 18:14 25:7 guys' 28:13 **hotel** 9:12,13,17 48:12 52:2 instrumental 10:2 11:10,11,14, income 10:5 18:18 21:12 17,19,24 12:19, Н 21,22 13:1 14:17 23:18 27:8 36:14, insufficient 34:9, 20:13 21:10,13 15 50:17 15 H-U-N-T-E-R 6:4 22:3 27:10,12 inconsistent 35:21 41:14,15,22 insurance 52:18 half 13:20 14:3,9 45:15 44:1 45:8,11 22:23 45:21,22 intended 40:15 46:15,24 47:1,11 incorrectly 32:21 **hand** 7:25 48:8,13 49:9 36:13 intent 6:22 10:9 50:20 51:17 happened 37:1 increase 28:1.4 Intercell 17:18 hotels 10:2 20:18, 34:2 45:10 47:20 happy 32:4 46:12 interest 27:24 21 21:1 25:14 49:8 increased 39:12 29:22 31:3 38:3 46:18 50:6 harbor 26:9 interesting 23:7 hundreds 46:19 increasing 47:23 hard 50:20 interim 8:13 Hunter 3:16 4:11 incurred 26:17 heading 16:3,11 6:2,3 7:18 30:15 interrupt 12:5 27:4 33:3,11 32:15,18,19 21:21 headquartered 41:13 37:11,13,15,17 15:16 introduce 14:20 41:3,5 44:21 54:2 India 11:12 12:10 hear 9:14 17:23 18:13 introductions **husband** 29:1,8 22:18,20,21 46:17 5:23 **heard** 5:12 32:20 34:10 35:11 Indian 15:13 invest 18:6 22:4 ı 36:15,23 39:13 48:7 indicating 40:14 46:8 I-N-N-O-V-A-T-I**invested** 18:7,9 individual 41:8 hearing 5:12,17, 22:11.16.17 27:24 **V-E** 16:6 19 7:13 53:19,25 individuals 26:21 31:5,9 35:23 38:6 I-N-T-E-R-C-E-L-40:5 43:7 48:10 hearing's 5:10 Indo 15:15 16:2 **L** 17:19 investing 10:1 heavily 9:15 15:8 industry 11:6 I-R-E-O 22:12,14 35:24 **held** 5:7.10 27:23 **infancy** 19:19 **IBM** 11:6,7 investment 9:8. 33:22 40:20,21 informal 10:9 11 10:3,4 18:16 **IBM1800** 11:6 helpful 32:3 21:16,18,24 22:1, information 5:21 Ice 36:20 6,7,13,20 23:3,5, high 41:23 infrastructure 6,8,10,12,13,19, ideal 12:16 history 16:24 22:12 23 24:10.20 **IIT** 17:22,23,25 25:18,19 27:9 holder 38:3 initial 18:11 50:1, 28:1,5,11,23,24 immigrant 46:17 hole 17:3 29:3 34:1,7,8,11, immigrated 15,16 35:13 36:3 initially 12:20 honor 36:10 12:14 14:3 18:8 20:9 37:2 39:22 40:15, hoping 51:15 21 41:12,18,24 **impact** 53:13 **Inn** 14:14 42:2,9 43:1 45:10 Hosey 3:5 5:14 implied 52:19 46:12 47:10 48:12 Innovative 16:5, 30:19,20,22 50:2,3,6,18 6,9 44:13,14 52:8,9, importance 11 13:23 investments 9:7, institute 14:11 11 21:19 35:24 17:23

39:13 40:2,23 June/july 20:10 leading 38:7 39:9,19 43:5 45:6, 41:7,9,10 47:13, 12,17 49:12,25 leading-age 15 51:2,10 Κ 19:23 investor 14:4.24 loans 33:5 40:1,4 learn 9:14 10:3,12 15:2,7 18:13 44:3 **Kanpur** 17:22 33:23 learned 50:22 local 15:3 kid 12:16 51:1 investors 15:1,2 logic 49:8 **Kids** 12:17 18:19 leased 11:14 long 51:21 kind 16:17 23:12 **involve** 49:12 leave 11:18 44:18 looked 25:3 47:16 involved 12:2 left 6:5 14:5 26:5 knew 48:4 13:25 14:2.11 lose 29:14 40:16 **Legal** 3:15 15:8,11 17:13 knocking 48:5 loses 47:10 18:20 23:9,12 legislative 36:16 knowledge 19:8, 26:22 45:8 48:3, **loss** 6:17 26:16,25 lend 19:17 9 28:13 18 33:15,17 38:14 **lender** 21:17 41:11 42:13,14 Korean 16:5 involvement 38:2 50:21 lending 25:10 losses 33:18,19 40:17,19 L involves 32:21 level 14:19 49:22 lot 41:23 liability 23:21 L-A-H-R-I 19:7 Ireo 22:12 24:10 28:7 **Lahri** 17:16 19:7 M issue 21:8 42:10 liable 39:11 20:1 25:24 45:19 issues 6:12,13 **Liberty** 14:7,22 M-O-S-N-I-E-R **Lambert** 3:6 5:15 6:7 items 19:25 30:23,24,25 life 10:1 44:16,17,25 45:3, made 6:20 10:1 lifeblood 21:13 23,25 52:12,14,15 18:15 27:15 28:25 J 41:21 32:23 34:10 35:6. **land** 13:10 light 37:4 9,17 40:1,3,4,24 jobs 12:24 larger 25:7 50:16 41:7,8 42:12,25 Likewise 40:20 join 15:12 Las 48:11 magnitude 22:8 limit 25:10 39:12 **joint** 11:5 law 5:13 8:25 main 9:11 10:4 limitation 33:18 10:16 26:18 33:2 **jointly** 39:10 maintain 37:9 34:14,16 36:15 lines 38:24 39:1 Josh 3:6 5:15 44:9 49:19 major 21:24 liquidity 39:18,21 judge 5:14,19,20 **Le** 3:4 5:5,13 6:3, make 9:21 10:11 6:3 7:18,19 8:6 **Litwin** 49:21 50:8 8.12 7:4.8.13.20. 27:8 29:13,16 10:16 30:15,19, 24 8:4 30:4,8,11, live 24:5,8 35:25 41:15 42:1 22,23,25 31:24 15,17,22,25 31:7, 47:12,14 48:24 lived 8:20,23 32:3,15 35:17 9,12,21 32:2,6,9 44:13,16,21 45:25 **makes** 41:22 35:17 37:10,12, livelihood 9:12 52:8,11,12,15 50:10 14,16 41:1,4 10:5 54:2.3 44:10,15 45:25 making 17:5 27:2 loan 6:24 9:6 16:3, 52:5,11,15,23 judges 5:13,17 34:6 39:18 51:5 11,12,13,14,15, 53:5,11,19 53:22 18,20,22 17:4 manager 14:19, lead 3:4 5:14,19 July 39:8 50:4 20:12 27:2 28:11 20 14:4 15:2 33:7 34:6 36:5,8,9 June 50:4 37:18,22 38:5,16

Index: managing..options

managing 25:14 20:9,17 21:24 motivation 21:8 0 22:8,9,11,16,17, 24:12 27:2,3 34:8, manufacturing 23,25 23:22,23 9,15,25 43:1,18 19:2 24:2,10 25:10,11 44:5,7 45:8,14 Oakland 16:7 Marguerite 3:17 27:24 28:7,8,10, 48:1 objections 6:25 6:6 11,17,20,22 29:4, motivations 23 31:6,10,18,19 obligated 29:16 Maria 2:20 26:10 45:16 48:9 35:12,13,18 36:2, 37:21 motive 6:22 9:3 **marked** 7:4,8 7,12 37:7,24 38:8, obligation 37:22 9 39:12,16 43:7 34:1,25 35:3 **market** 39:15 45:18,21,22 38:13 40:3,5 **obtain** 12:19 43:12 47:23 47:12,20 48:11 13:13 19:16 21:4 **Mountain** 13:4.10 49:25 50:1,7 master 11:3 17:21 51:1 14:14 51:10 53:1 26:2 obtained 19:3 **move** 6:12 13:22 million-dollar matter 2:6 5:6 17:9 38:6 41:1 obtaining 13:24 21:16,18 28:23 6:13 36:16 27:13 36:3 47:15 50:1 multi-million-Mauritius 22:19, dollar 35:21 **October** 11:19 millions 43:25 21 multiple 26:22 mind 9:21 11:9 Office 2:2.16 5:7 measure 35:3 47:22 48:9 20:5 39:15 Officer 16:13 mutually 37:20 minor 38:3 Mechanical 11:3 one's 48:10 minutes 6:21 mechanically ongoing 39:7 Ν 42:14 7:14,15 17:24 online 11:7 26:5 30:1,5 32:13 medalist 17:22 names 5:24 18:1 46:3 **OO** 4:5 7:9.11 39:1 medical 11:6 narrow 49:4 **moment** 13:24 opened 12:4 26:3 32:10 meet 5:17 29:10 narrowed 52:25 13:12 53:22 money 11:14 18:5 natural 42:16 opening 5:6 7:14, 19:13,18 20:16 Mellon 17:21 18:5 22 27:23 28:2 needed 5:22 22:20 23:10 29:8 43:20 member 14:13 12:15 18:22 43:8, 29:13,18 40:1,17, operate 37:25 24 41:8,23 43:6, members 3:3 14 46:11 47:7 5:15 net 6:16 42:14 operating 6:17 50:11,12 51:3 9:16 18:25 19:1 mention 41:21 **Nice** 6:2 37:24 42:14 43:10 month 29:24 mentioned 13:24 **NN** 7:4,6 morning 6:2,6 operational 39:7 14:22 15:1 21:10. 10:21 36:23 nonbusiness 11 41:10 46:22 operations 21:13 9:22 26:11 32:24 mortgage 20:16 37:18 47:21 mere 25:18 27:22 33:9,14,16,20 39:23 40:9,18 opinion 5:18 mortgagemic 41:1 42:12 49:11 52:20 53:23 **backed** 22:10 microphone notated 6:20 opportunities Mosnier 3:17 10:22 4:12 6:6 42:20,23 48:6 49:19 note 40:12 migrant 11:22 opportunity 8:16 motel 12:16,22 November 43:21 Mike 3:45:13 49:4 13:9 number 5:8 32:1 million 10:3 13:20 **options** 19:12 **motels** 12:18 46:18 14:3,9 18:9,17,19

Index: oral..process

oral 7:13 participants 5:18 38:17 47:12 order 34:4 38:16 participate 5:21 period 8:23 12:11 possibility 46:13 39:6 15:20 parties 5:24 6:20 potential 16:20 orders 6:21 8:17 37:20 49:7 permanent 12:14 23:21 24:4,10 53:13 29:3 49:24 50:11, ordinary 33:15 person 5:10 8:20 17 51:2 parties' 5:23 14:20 26:9 29:2 organize 14:6 50:14 potentially 9:20 partner 20:2 23:19 51:10 organized 13:20 47:17 personal 33:23 15:14 **Prabhu** 17:20 34:11,16 40:2,21, parts 27:22 23 41:7,10,12,16, 20:2 45:19 organizing 12:2 18,24 42:8 party 44:18 52:7, 14:3 pre-covid 46:23 8,13 original 14:8 personally 18:5 precedential party's 7:1 39:18 OTA 5:8 36:21 36:21 past 16:24 51:6 personally/ outset 32:22 precisely 45:13 severally 37:21 48:21 Patel 2:7 4:16 5:6 preferred 36:2 **Ph.d.** 17:16,21 6:10,11,21 7:21, owner 12:23 13:7, 44:22 24 8:3,21 9:10 18:4 20:1,3 10:9,10,14,21 prepared 51:22 **Philadelphia** ownership 31:21 26:8,21 27:18 11:4,21 present 6:10 28:3 30:9,10 31:5, owning 25:14 53:15 8,11,14,24 37:5 phonetic 22:9 39:17,20 43:8 presentation 4:8 23:1 Р 45:4,18 46:10,15 7:17 8:5,8 32:12, photovoltaic 47:8,13,25 48:6 17 42:22 44:11 17:17 19:22 52:1 51:22 **p.m.** 54:1 phrase 46:9 Patel's 43:1,19,24 presentations **P.O.** 3:15 50:14,20 52:10 **picking** 11:13 paid 12:23 44:1 pay 16:21 37:21 picture 17:4 preserve 43:18 47:19 48:18 51:11 45:6 52:18 prestigious pioneer 11:11 pandemic 8:12 paying 6:23 16:25 17:22 place 12:16,18 panel 3:3 5:12,16, 29:17,22 previously 10:16 20 8:15 11:1 14:1 plan 26:3 payment 12:24 25:19,25 30:17 primarily 21:7 13:7 35:5 43:19, **plans** 11:25 35:23 40:21 41:25 23 44:7 49:13 primary 24:11 42:10 43:12 44:11 **pocket** 29:18 25:12 27:10 34:5 51:18 52:4,6 payments 29:16 point 18:22 34:20 40:3,7 41:16 pristine 51:12 panel's 17:11 35:7,10,19 39:24 **people** 46:19,21, private 14:21 53:10 paper 17:2 31:25 23 18:19 portfolio 20:21 paragraph 38:1 percent 14:8 proceed 8:5 27:11,12 46:18 parameter 16:16 18:21 29:23 32:13 46:4 48:8 parameters percentage proceedings portion 53:4 36:19 31:22 2:15 54:4 posit 27:3 42:6 pardon 21:21 perform 38:11 proceeds 37:8,18 position 38:2 part 19:16 40:13 performance process 11:7 39:18,21 42:7

16:19 48:3 51:1 pursuant 15:25 **reason** 11:10 repaid 44:2 24:13 34:6 51:24 produce 5:18 **pursue** 26:19 repeat 33:2 38:21 rebuttal 26:4 30:6 33:23 products 47:23 **reply** 49:21 50:9 46:2 52:5 pursuits 34:13 51:19 53:2 profit 33:23 34:11, 42:9 recall 20:21 16,25 35:25 report 33:19 38:13,19,21,23 put 13:16 22:9,20 received 4:4,5 reported 2:19 40:2,5,22 41:7 31:18 43:14 7:3,6,11 36:2 32:21 36:13 profitable 38:17 putting 48:11 recent 36:21 Reporter 2:21 43:16 reclassified 40:8 represent 5:25 project 10:6 Q record 5:5,6,24 25:11 representatives 7:2,5,10 27:10 51:23 question 21:23 projects 9:16 34:5 36:24 37:14 35:11,14,18 45:4 27:13 43:15,17 53:21 representing 52:16 8:18 RECROSS 4:15 **proof** 36:12 questions 5:20 reputation 43:24 **REDIRECT** 4:15 properly 40:18 7:16 12:7 27:19 44:4 48:19 49:14 42:15 30:13,16,18,19, Redwood 11:19 requested 32:12 20,23,24 31:1 properties 10:2 14:18 32:10 42:5,18 requests 16:13 refer 32:3 38:24 property 11:19,20 44:12,13,14,16 51:18 53:2 13:3,5,11,14 require 11:25 52:7,8,9,12,14 14:14,15,17 15:7 53:8 referenced 51:22 required 44:9 20:16,24 quickly 50:21,22 referring 27:22 requirement protect 24:2 27:4, 29:10 quote 27:23 29:1, 25 28:4,8,22 34:2 regions 18:14 9 40:13,14 43:9 43:1,23 48:19 requires 49:2 Regulation 34:20 49:14 reserve 26:4 30:3 R reinforces 42:7 protected 41:18 residents 12:14 Rejeeva 17:16 protecting 39:21 raise 7:24 18:10 respondent 3:13 44:6 related 26:25 33:8 19:14 31:16 39:15 5:25 6:4,7,16 8:17 34:1.7 35:2 41:13 protest 43:21 47:3 25:17 27:15 29:1 43:19 30:12,13 32:11, **raised** 23:10 provide 8:22 18:1 relation 40:10 18,19 38:25 40:7 35:11 proving 36:18 42:23 44:10,12 relationship raising 18:18,20 48:15 proximate 34:24 19:8.10 20:11.15 19:12 40:10 34:24 43:18 44:6 respondent's 4:5 Ranch 22:25 51:11 7:4,6,8,11 9:8 proximately 27:23 42:7 51:22 Rancho 3:15 26:25 35:2 relationships 50:24 response 37:3 reach 25:9 purchase 12:19, 43:21,22 relied 25:24 read 36:24 responsible purchased 11:18 relies 9:15 real 9:12,15 13:4, 41:15 13:1,3,5 11 23:1 25:14 relocated 12:10 resulted 8:23 46:15 purpose 35:24 remaining 30:1,5 resulting 40:17 reality 17:2 29:14 purposes 33:24 Remember 43:4

return 6:15 24:24 **send** 53:23 51:8 52:18 **sold** 15:19 36:14 40:6 41:8 sense 41:22 Signet's 37:9 sole 35:24 returns 6:18 50:10 38:17 sought 39:17,20 38:12 sentence 52:3 significant 27:24 source 10:5 Revenue 9:2,3 34:8 separate 42:3 **South** 14:6 review 8:16 significantly series 47:12,14 Southern 16:7 16:13,16,17 50:5 set 8:10 9:18 rise 33:15,16 signing 37:22 **speak** 10:23 48:21 49:4 risk 24:1 28:7 Silicon 24:5,6 **specific** 45:1 51:2 **settle** 11:12 48:22 49:23,24 47:5 52:3 severally 39:11 **similar** 21:19 speculation road 49:4 shareholder 27:22 role 16:9 simple 49:8,9 38:19 speculative roles 15:24 simply 41:18 44:6 shareholders 27:18 36:4 45:6 roughly 14:8 16:8 **single** 12:22 spelling 18:1 17:10 20:22,25 49:16 shares 36:2 21:2 squarely 36:18 sink 29:14 **sharp** 20:5 round 31:6,15,17, **stabilize** 39:17,20 sir 37:13 19 44:23 **shift** 21:7 **stage** 19:19 **sister** 12:12 **RPR** 2:20 short-term 33:17 start 29:12 46:3 situation 38:4 running 10:2 33:6 Shorthand 2:21 47:2,13,14 49:1, **start-up** 19:17,18 runs 35:21 12 50:15 **show** 50:5 24:2,3,6,8 25:18 48:4 size 49:22 **shows** 27:10 S 46:14 started 6:23 11:4, skin 35:18 23 13:9 14:10,18 **sibling** 12:13 slippery 9:20 15:14 19:22 20:15 Sacramento 2:3, 48:23 **side** 9:6,8,10 10:4 16 5:1,10 starting 5:25 15:8 22:6 25:19 **slope** 9:20 48:23 32:13 **sales** 33:6 34:11 35:22 **slot** 17:24 state 2:1,22 3:14 **San** 11:13.15 signed 31:23 42:2 5:24 12:10 14:6 15:16 **slowly** 10:23 52:1 **stated** 26:23 **Santa** 13:6 **Signet** 9:10 10:3 **small** 13:19 statement 4:20 17:10,12,14,15 Sara 3:5 5:14 **smaller** 13:18 18:6,10 19:17,22 7:14 **sat** 47:2 21:9,16,18,23 **Smith** 34:19 statements 46:2 22:6 23:3,7,9,14, **saving** 12:24 **solar** 9:10 10:3 17,22 24:15,16, **States** 26:24 17:10,12,14,15 **school** 12:17 20,22 25:4,18 33:22 34:17 35:7 19:22 21:16,18,23 27:7,25 28:1,5,12 searching 53:1 statute 26:14 23:8,9,14 24:20 29:2,9,16,18,21 25:18,19,24 27:7 **Section** 9:1 26:11 31:3,4,22 37:8,19, **stay** 12:16,17,18 35:23 37:23 40:20 27:4 39:6 23 38:2,9,10,11 sterling 43:24 41:16,25 42:9 39:8 41:9 42:9 **secure** 22:19 43:12 46:10 47:3, 43:4,13,15 45:9 stipulations 6:20 18 49:25 50:18 security 22:10 46:10 47:3,18,21 51:8 stock 14:7 34:3 49:6,25 50:18

35:24 36:2 38:3,6 survived 8:12 term 9:8 **top** 24:25 38:1,15 40:20 44:22,24 terms 37:1 38:11 swear 7:21 8:1 **trade** 26:13,17,20 **stop** 37:10 27:1 33:4,8,11,12, sworn 10:16 testified 10:17 23 35:2 40:11 story 11:17 46:16 27:6 35:20 36:4,7 system 11:5 40:22 41:17 47:8 **trades** 34:13 Street 2:16 systems 11:8 testify 6:22 transaction 9:5 strike 42:19 35:15,16 38:20,22 testifying 10:11 Т struggling 24:4 39:4 testimony 4:14 **TRANSCRIPT** sub-issue 42:11 7:15 8:22 10:8 takeaway 49:9 2:15 submit 52:4 30:9,21 34:10 taking 10:8 46:11 36:23 42:6 43:9 transparent submitted 38:25 49:23 22:22 textbook 39:22 53:21 talk 26:7 Treasury 34:20 therefrom 40:17 subsequent 37:2 talking 9:19 13:22 treated 12:21 thereunder 39:11 subsequently 20:8 25:10 treatment 33:16, 12:20 14:19 thing 19:24 25:4 tax 2:2,16 3:14 17 42:13 48:25 48:4 subsidy 28:17 5:7,15 6:1,4,7,15, true 16:23 28:21 18 9:3,23 26:18, substantial 49:2. things 12:1 17:1 29:21 20 32:11,20 33:24 21:15 24:14 26:10 24 36:14,15 40:6 truth 8:1,2 substantially thinking 19:23 41:8 50:7 Tuesday 2:18 5:2, 49:13 Taxation 9:2 suburb 11:4 thought 22:4 taxpayer 9:4,20 28:19 42:4 47:8,9 tune 51:10 succeed 23:17 26:14,15,19 throw 35:12 50:11 **turn** 10:8,22 26:3 24:15.16.17.19.23 34:10,23 36:17 28:13 30:11.17 32:11 38:8,11,16 39:25 time 5:9 6:22 7:20 33:1 40:16 44:11 48:18 succeeds 24:20, 8:21,23 9:4 10:10 46:1 52:6 23 49:7 12:11 14:16 taxpayer's 26:17 15:15,20 16:11,25 turning 6:8 27:1,2 33:4,10,12 **success** 40:15 19:13,14,21 34:25 35:2,3 38:1 46:15 47:11 50:19 typically 49:11 20:12,13,17,19,23 taxpayers 33:19 21:1,2,16,19,25 successful 22:3 48:23,25 U 22:7 25:9,12 26:4 29:2 40:24 41:6 28:14,18 30:3,11, 46:8,10,11,17,24 technical 20:4 48:5 20,24 31:3,14,22 **U.S.** 23:2 48:16 technological 34:22 35:4,16 49:22 **suffer** 41:11 22:24 24:13 28:13 42:25 43:3,13 ultimately 21:23 44:7,8 46:20,21 suffered 38:13 technology 48:20 49:13 50:7 19:23 28:14,16 understand 31:7 sums 40:1 51:14,15,21 52:6 50:13 Telesoft 22:24 suppliers 33:5 times 35:12 unique 8:10 9:18, **telling** 11:16 support 12:14 25 47:2,11 48:21 today 8:18,21 34:4 43:3 ten 20:23 30:1,5 49:16 50:14,15 9:14 10:23 15:18 26:4 47:8 51:12 **Supreme** 26:23 tend 45:2 **United** 26:24 53:20 33:22 34:17 33:22 34:17 35:7 tens 43:25 **Today's** 5:8,12 surfaced 44:7

units 11:19 13:4 14:13,15 University 11:3 Westerns 14:12 unrelated 41:14, whim 9:23 25 Whipple 33:25 **upside** 48:13 wild 46:14 50:19 upwards 46:22 wildly 40:24 41:6 user 12:22 46:8,10,11 utilized 51:7 win 49:7 win-win 25:4 ٧ 51:16 **WITNESSES** V-A-R-D-E-L-L 4:15 36:22 wondering 44:17 V-A-R-N-E-R words 33:13 39:24 work 11:4,9 12:18 valley 11:13 24:5, 15:6 48:2 50:20 6 47:5 working 12:1 valuation 31:16 22:10 50:6 worth 14:7 Vardell 36:22 worthlessness Varner 39:24,25 26:16 **VC** 19:15 **wow** 49:14 VCS 47:6 write-up 16:14,15 Vegas 48:11 written 5:18 53:23 venture 11:5 19:15 40:14 47:4 Υ View 13:4,10 14:14 year 8:19 13:2 Villanova 11:3 26:20 31:12 33:18 39:20 W years 8:13 16:8 21:11 26:19 42:15 46:18,19 W-H-I-P-P-L-E 33:25 yell 41:5 wanted 23:14,17 York 17:17 27:25 28:4 51:13 warming 19:24 ways 27:12 Wells 15:19 Western 13:11