BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF:)
ADDIGON DOOLG ING)
ADDISON POOLS, INC.,) OTA NO.: 20096720
Appellant.)

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Cerritos, California

Wednesday, February 15, 2023

Reported by:

MARIE C. SANCHEZ CSR No. 13809

Job No.: 40541 OTA(C)

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF:)
6	ADDISON POOLS, INC.,) OTA NO.: 20096720
7	Appellant.)
8)
9	
LO	
11	
12	
13	
L4	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
L6	12900 Park Plaza Drive, Suite 300, Cerritos,
L7	California, commencing at 3:10 p.m. and
18	concluding at 4:58 p.m. on Wednesday,
L9	February 15, 2023, reported by MARIE SANCHEZ,
20	CSR No. 13809, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
21	in and for the State of California.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Panel Lead:	ALJ SUZANNE BROWN
4	Panel Members:	ALT MICHAEL GEARY
5	raner Members.	ALJ ANDREW WONG
6	For the Appellant:	BARRY MOSER
7	ror one ripperrane	
8 9	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND FEE ADMINISTRATION
10		NALAN SAMARAWICKREMA
11		JASON PARKER CHRISTOPHER BROOKS
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	Ţ
1	I N D E X
2	
3	EXHIBITS
4	
5	(Appellants' Exhibit 1 was received at page 14)
6	(Department's Exhibits A through K were received at page 21)
7	
8	
9	
10	PRESENTATION
11	
12	PAGE
13	By Mr. Moser 22
14	By Mr. Samarawickrema 31
15	
16	
17	
18	CLOSING STATEMENT
19	
20	PAGE
21	By Mr. Moser 55
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERRITOS, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2023 3:10 p.m.

2.

2.4

JUDGE BROWN: Good afternoon. This is the appeal of Addison Pools Inc, and we are on the record. This is OTA Case Number 20096720. I am Suzanne Brown, and I am the Lead Administrative Law Judge in -- conducting the hearing for this case.

This case -- this hearing is before the Office of Tax Appeals or OTA. I will remind everyone that OTA is not a court but is an independent appeals body. OTA is staffed by tax experts and is independent from the state's tax agencies. Because OTA is a separate agency from the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration, arguments and evidence that were previously presented to CDTFA are not necessarily part of the record before OTA.

OTA's written opinion for this appeal will be based upon the briefs the parties have submitted to OTA, the exhibits that will be admitted into evidence, and the arguments presented at hearing today.

As a reminder, this Panel does not engage in ex-parte communications with either party. My co-panelists today are Judge Andrew Wong and Judge Michael Geary.

Although I am the Lead ALJ for purposes of conducting the

hearing, all three ALJ's are coequal decision makers in this process and are free to ask questions at any time.

2.4

Also present is our Stenographer Mrs. Sanchez who is reporting this hearing verbatim. To ensure we have an accurate record, we ask that everyone speaks one at a time and does not speak over each other. Also, speak clearly and loudly into the microphones. When needed, the Stenographer may stop the hearing process and ask for clarification.

After the hearing, the Stenographer will produce an official hearing transcript which will be available on the Offices of Tax Appeals website. And, I believe, I said we are on the record with the appeal of Addison Pools Inc, OTA Case Number 20096720. Today is Wednesday, February 15th, 2023, and it is approximately 3:13 p.m.

We are holding this hearing in Cerritos,

California. As I said, I am Suzanne Brown. I'm the Lead

ALJ for this case. My co-panelists today are

Judge Andrew Wong and Judge Michael Geary. I will start by asking each of the participants to please state their names for the record. And I will start with the representatives for CDTFA.

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Nalan Samarawickrema for the Department.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I didn't get that.

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Nalan Samarawickrema for the

Department.

2.2

2.4

MR. PARKER: Jason Parker, Chief of Headquarters Operations Bureau with CDTFA.

MR. BROOKS: Christopher Brooks, Tax Counsel for CDTFA.

JUDGE BROWN: Thank you. And the representative for Appellant.

MR. MOSER: Barry Moser.

JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Next, what I'm going to do is first I'm going to confirm what the issues are for hearing today and then I'm going to talk about admitting the exhibits for hearing today.

We had a prehearing conference in this matter on January 17th of 2023 and I issued a prehearing conference minutes and orders afterwards that summarized everything that we talked about during the prehearing conference. As we discussed at the prehearing conference and I confirmed in the minutes and orders there are two issues for hearing. The first issue is whether additional adjustments are warranted to the unreported taxable measure based on the cost of accountability test. And the second issue is whether relief of interest is warranted.

First I want to talk about the second issue, the relief of interest, because the question I had at the prehearing conference, as I recall, is whether Appellant is

1 seeking relief of interest for any time periods beyond what 2 CDTFA has already conceded as relief of interest. Mr. Moser, 3 do you recall we discussed this during the prehearing 4 conference? 5 MR. MOSER: Yes. Okay. And you saw the periods -- I think 6 JUDGE BROWN: 7 totaled 15 months that CDTFA is conceding relief of interest. So the question is: Is Appellant seeking any additional 8 9 relief beyond the periods that are conceded? 10 MR. MOSER: Yes. Yes. I think that I'm hearing that you need to 11 JUDGE BROWN: 12 be closer to the microphone. Is your green light on? 13 MR. MOSER: Yes. 14 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Then if you can just move the mic 15 Move you closer to the mic. closer to you. 16 MR. MOSER: Okay. Is that better? Is that better? 17 I think so, yes. Yes. JUDGE BROWN: 18 MR. MOSER: Okay. 19 JUDGE BROWN: All right. What periods are you seeking 20 relief of interest for beyond what CDTFA has already 21 conceded? 22 MR. MOSER: I think the periods from March 2019 to 23 February 2023. 2.4 JUDGE BROWN: All right. Hold on just a second. Now, 25 CDTFA has conceded -- CDTFA has conceded for the periods

December -- December 2013, May, and June -- I'm not going to list them all -- they've conceded for some periods that include June to August -- through August 2019 and October 2019 to January 31st, 2020, that are covered by what the period you just identified.

They also conceded periods prior to what you just identified, so I won't get into those. But, I guess, the question is if you are con -- the CDTFA issued its decision and then you filed this appeal with OTA in September of 2020, so any relief of interest beyond after CDTFA issued the -- their appeal is -- is, I believe, not something that my office can address.

MR. MOSER: Yeah. I had a hard time understanding exactly which periods they were conceding. And -- so my understanding on -- I mean, the -- the reason that I'm asking for this is that this audit has gone on for ten years and there are long stretches of time where we had no communications from auditors or appeals or wherever, and so during those times, that's what I was trying to figure as to the interest should stop during those times. So -- because I think -- when did we --

JUDGE BROWN: All right. Well, my first -- my first question was what time periods you're conceding? I'm just -- I will note that part of the time period -- sorry -- what time periods you are alleging relief of interest is warranted

beyond what is conceded? I will note that part of the period that you just identified is already conceded, June through August 2019 and October 2019 through January 2020 is already conceded.

So you are saying in addition, March 2019 through May 2019 and then all periods after January 31st, 2020. And then my next question is related to this: Why don't we have your request for relief of interest that we discussed at the prehearing conference? If you recall, you agreed and I put in the order that you were going to submit it by January 31st.

MR. MOSER: Oh, I misunderstood then. I didn't realize I had to put in a request.

JUDGE BROWN: Did you receive the minutes and orders, the document that we sent on January 23rd, I believe, that confirmed what we talked about?

MR. MOSER: Yeah, I did get it. Yes.

JUDGE BROWN: Okay.

2.4

MR. MOSER: I just misunderstood. I thought it was all coming up in -- during this hearing. That's why.

JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Well, we can't grant any relief of interest if we don't have the signed request for relief of interest. Now, when we talked about it at the prehearing conference, I thought I had -- I'm sure -- certain that I asked you to submit it by January 31st. How much time do you

1 think you would need to submit the request for relief of 2 interest? Like, a week? Two weeks? 3 MR. MOSER: You mean from now? 4 JUDGE BROWN: From now. 5 MR. MOSER: Oh, yeah. What is -- yeah. If we can do a 6 week, until next Wednesday. 7 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. 8 MR. MOSER: And I just send that to that evidence. 9 JUDGE BROWN: The same -- the same E-mail address that 10 you were submitting everything else with a copy to CDTFA. All right. CDTFA, do you have any response to 11 12 what we were just discussing about the issue two, about 13 relief of interest? 14 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: I did not understand your question, 15 your Honor. 16 JUDGE BROWN: I was talking too fast. I said, do you 17 have any response or question or objection to anything that 18 we just discussed about submitting the request for relief of 19 interest? 20 I have no objections. MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: 21 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. I don't know if you're going to 22 want to respond to the written request for relief, but I 23 wanted -- I need to at least get it in writing because I 2.4 can't grant anything even the conceded portions.

Right.

Yeah.

25

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA:

1 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. All right. 2 MR. MOSER: Do I have to say anything about the conceded 3 portions or just -- just on the new -- the new portions? 4 JUDGE BROWN: CDTFA, do you have any thoughts on that? 5 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Based on our review, we -- we 6 recommend a 15 months, but we don't have the request signed 7 by the Appellant, so in order to -- to become effective then 8 we need a request. 9 JUDGE BROWN: No, I understand. You need it in 10 writing --11 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yeah. Right. 12 JUDGE BROWN: -- under -- in writing under penalty of 13 perjury. 14 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yeah. Under penalty of perjury. 15 JUDGE BROWN: I understand that. 16 MR. PARKER: Also, Judge Brown, I'd just like to add 17 we've already conceded those months, so I don't see the 18 purpose in addressing those in his presentation since we've 19 already given those away. 20 JUDGE BROWN: Right. 21 MR. PARKER: Assuming he files the form. JUDGE BROWN: 22 That is what I was asking. I just wanted 23 to let you respond. So I'll say Appellant does not need to 2.4 address the conceded portions, but I also want to clarify that I'm not aware of any authority that allows relief of 25

interest for periods after the CDT -- CDTFA has issued its decision and Appellant filed the appeal with the Office of Tax Appeals, so you would want to focus your argument regarding any non-conceded portions on the period of time when CDTFA actually still was -- when the case was with CDTFA as opposed to when it left CDTFA's possession and you changed -- and you filed your appeal with OTA.

All right. Next, I believe, as I said we already clarified what issue one is. And then we clarified issue two. If anyone has any -- if no one has anything further on clarifying the issues, CDTFA?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: No, we don't have.

2.4

JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Then I will just confirm that Appellant will submit the request for relief of interest in writing under penalty of perjury.

Mr. Moser, if you would refer back to the prehearing conference minutes and orders that I issued a couple of weeks ago, I believe, it was January 23rd, and it contains a website address for where you can find a form that's on CDTFA's website. It's Form 735-A. You don't have to use that form for your request for relief of interest, but it's convenient to use it because it already contains the language that you need regarding penalty of perjury. So it's available as a resource to you.

All right. Then if we've confirmed the two issues

1 of hearing, the next I want to move on to admitting the 2 exhibits. All right. As I reminded the parties during the 3 prehearing conference and as I indicated -- confirmed during 4 the prehearing conference minutes and orders, OTA's 5 regulations require submission of exhibits at least 15 days prior to the hearing which, in this case, was January 31st. 6 I'm going to talk about Appellant's exhibits 7 first -- exhibits first and then next I will address CDTFA's 8 exhibits. Appellant timely submitted Exhibit 1 which is 9 10 pages of Excel Spreadsheets. And, first, I'm going to say at the time of the hearing -- of the prehearing conference I 11 asked CDTFA if they had any objection to admission of 12 13 Exhibit 1. CDTFA indicated that it hadn't had time to review 14 that document yet because we had just received it right 15 before the prehearing conference on January 17th. I asked if CDTFA would identify any objection if 16 it had one by February 8th. We didn't -- I didn't receive 17 18 any notification of an objection, so from that I infer CDTFA 19 doesn't object to Exhibit 1, all those Excel Spreadsheets 20 being admitted; is that correct? 21 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: That's correct. 22 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Then I will say Appellant's 2.3 Exhibit 1 is admitted. 2.4 (Appellants' Exhibits 1 was received 25 in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)

JUDGE BROWN: Next I want to move onto the documents we received more recently. After the close of business on February 13th, Appellant submitted an additional spreadsheet and 13 pages of invoices that OTA received. Because of the way our system works we didn't receive them until the morning of February 14th which was yesterday. And I will say -- first I'll call these proposed Exhibit 2. I'm just going to label all of them together as proposed Exhibit 2.

2.4

I have two questions for Appellant. The first -and then I will ask CDTFA to respond -- the first question is
why weren't these timely submitted, given that we discussed
at the prehearing conference January 31st is the deadline?
That's not the first time that my office notified Appellant
of our -- of the -- that evidence needs to be submitted well
in advance of the hearing.

This case was first filed in September of 2020 when my office acknowledged the receipt of the appeal. Our form letter says that the parties need to submit their evidence in advance when we notified the parties of the hearing in -- that notice went out in December of 2022. It states, "Evidence needs to be submitted well in advance."

So, Mr. Moser, why did we just get these yesterday?

MR. MOSER: This new exhibit is really just a rearranging of the prior exhibit, and they tried to put --

the client tried to put it in a little easier format to -- to read and then they attached also copies of the invoices that related to the -- to the exhibit.

They were having problems going back and finding these invoices and because of the long delay on this, and so that's what I tried to -- I tried to have them go back and get the invoices because that's really my whole contention on this whole audit was no one looked at the invoices.

They did look at them, but there was a problem with it. So that's what I was trying to do was just trying to make it easier. It's really -- there's no new information on this exhibit than was on the other one. It's just a reformatting of it in trying to put it better so that someone can look at the -- the invoice and you can also see that either the tax was paid on the invoice or it wasn't paid. That's --

JUDGE BROWN: So are you saying that the spreadsheet portion is the same as all that information is contained in the spreadsheets you submitted in Exhibit 1?

MR. MOSER: Yes.

2.4

JUDGE BROWN: Is it the part that is labeled "miscategorized" on Exhibit 1?

MR. MOSER: No. It should be the -- the main spreadsheet.

JUDGE BROWN: On sheet one?

1	MR. MOSER: It's well, the original spreadsheet was
2	many pages, and this is just it's really what this is
3	doing is reformatting that that into an easier way of
4	reading it.
5	JUDGE BROWN: All right. But then the invoices
6	themselves
7	MR. MOSER: Relate to the to relate to the listing
8	that's there.
9	JUDGE BROWN: All right. But
10	MR. MOSER: And those invoices would relate to the
11	original spreadsheet also because they're the same items.
12	JUDGE BROWN: But does that has Appellant previously
13	submitted those invoices as evidence? Did CDTFA ever get
14	them?
15	MR. MOSER: Well, I sent them to everybody.
16	JUDGE BROWN: But you sent them two days before the
17	hearing, really one day practically effectively.
18	MR. MOSER: Okay.
19	JUDGE BROWN: So my question is why weren't they
20	submitted sooner with the before the deadline?
21	MR. MOSER: Because they were trying to find these
22	invoices. That was the thing. They were trying to match up
23	the invoices to to the listings.
24	JUDGE BROWN: Right. But this hearing was filed in
25	September of 2020, so why didn't why weren't they

submitted earlier?

2.

MR. MOSER: I'm not following that.

JUDGE BROWN: I'm just saying your client had two and a half years to put this evidence together, and we indicate -- I indicated when we had the prehearing conference that we needed them in time by this deadline because this is -- our regulation say 15 days before the hearing.

MR. MOSER: No, I understand what you're saying.

And what -- I mean, the problem is, is this -- the long delay on this whole thing is that, you know, you can't just keep these files readily available all the time when it's so -- when they're so old. I mean, people have businesses. They have limited space, so they put things in boxes and, you know, they label them. And so they had to go back and find these invoices again and match them up to -- to -- to the invoices. We had shown this during the audits and stuff and that -- this whole thing is very frustrating on my part for the way the audit was -- was conducted.

And, I mean, this may not be the right time to go through it, but I'll go through that --

JUDGE BROWN: Well, I -- let's just focus on the exhibits right now.

MR. MOSER: -- but that was the reason that it was late. It was just the client was trying to find all these invoices again.

All right. And, CDTFA, I am going to get JUDGE BROWN: to you next, so I appreciate your patience. The second question -- before I do that though -- the second question I was going to ask Appellant is I was going to ask for an offer of proof. In a brief summary can you say what is it that you contend these new documents that you just submitted will -what will they establish if they are admitted into evidence? MR. MOSER: Well, they show that either the tax was paid on these invoices or if the tax wasn't paid, that it wasn't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

required to be paid. I will say there are a few errors in here, but -- but that's really what it's supposed to show.

It's a listing of invoices where there was tax due and invoices that there was no tax due and was showing the actual invoice so, you know, someone can see that there was no tax due on it because it was late or whatever and there -or there was tax due because it was equipment or something they don't require tax.

JUDGE BROWN: All right. Now, I'm going to turn to And first I will ask, does CDTFA have any objection CDTFA. to the admission of what I've labeled as Appellant's Exhibit 2, the documents that were submitted at the end of day on Monday, February 13th, that we all received the morning of February 14th, yesterday?

Yes, we do, based on timeliness. MR. BROOKS:

JUDGE BROWN: And then we also received one additional

invoice just this morning from Appellant, and I think that that's probably all of my questions about the earlier documents are probably -- I think that everything is pretty much the same in terms of the -- the invoice we received today. I was going to ask the same questions, but I'm anticipating that it's -- I'm going to -- I would get the same response as to why they were late and why it was late and what the invoice would prove.

2.4

MR. MOSER: Yeah. It's -- it's just related to the -- to their - to their documents. They had a listing of X-tax invoices and this shows why it's wrong on their schedule.

JUDGE BROWN: All right. I'm going to uphold the objection based on timeliness. I think the documents came in too late for CDTFA to be able to have a meaningful response.

I will say, Appellant, you can refer to the documents if you -- they are part of your argument, but I'm not going to admit them as exhibits because it is contrary to our rules of our regulations with the 15-day deadline. I did admit Appellant's Exhibit 1 and now I'm going to move onto CDTFA Exhibits A through K.

At the prehearing conference Appellant said it had no objections to admission of those exhibits, and CDTFA you have no additional documents other than Exhibits A through K; correct?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yes, that's correct.

JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Appellant, assuming that you have no objection to admission of those documents --

MR. MOSER: No.

2.4

JUDGE BROWN: -- right, that we discussed at the prehearing conference, I will say CDTFA Exhibits A through K are admitted.

(Department's Exhibits A through K were received in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)

JUDGE BROWN: Next, I will just confirm neither party is calling any witnesses. And I will just go over again as it indicates in my prehearing conference, minutes, and orders what the order of events will be. We'll have Appellant's presentation first, and Appellant will have up to 30 minutes. Mr. Moser, you do not have to use all of that time. That's a maximum.

I am cognizant that it is late in the afternoon, so I'm going to try to streamline things. Next, we will have CDTFA's presentation. And in the interest of time, I may just condense the Judges' questions all into one -- one block after both parties have made their initial presentations.

We'll see.

After we have questions from the judges, then we have time for Appellant's rebuttal, and Appellant has up to 15 minutes. And then, CDTFA, we discussed at the prehearing conference if you wish to make a brief rebuttal you can, but

we'll see if the time -- if you don't, that's fine as well.

I've admitted the exhibits. We've gone over the schedule for this afternoon. Does anyone have anything else to raise before we begin with the presentations? Does anyone have any questions about any logistical things at the hearing today?

MR. MOSER: No.

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: No.

JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Then we can proceed with the Appellant's presentation. Mr. Moser, whenever you're ready. You have 30 minutes.

2.4

PRESENTATION

MR. MOSER: The first thing I just wanted to -- to talk about was the removal of the interest, so that I'm just going to do with the -- by -- by written request and then that will take care of that; right? We don't need to discuss any more on that.

So the -- the main issue that I have with this audit and the -- the reason that I've taken it this far is this audit was conducted in -- in my office. And when the audit happened we brought in every invoice, every purchase invoice that -- that the client had. We had six or eight boxes of these invoices, and the auditor sat there in my office for two to three weeks going through these invoices.

During that time, never once did the auditor ever ask a question. At the end of the time that she was there, did whatever she had to do, she said she's not coming back anymore, she's done, and as far as she was concerned the audit was, from her point, was complete. So that was -- the audit, I guess, started sometime in March. That was probably sometime in May, June that it happened.

And -- and she said she would issue a report.

Never asked a question. Never commented that she had any questions about anything that she found any errors or whatever. Sometime in August I contacted her because we don't have a big office and we had all these boxes. And I contacted her and said, "Do I need to hold onto these invoices anymore? Do you have any questions about them? Or can I give them back to the client?" And she said, "No. You can give them back. We don't need them anymore."

Maybe about a month or two later, sometime

September, October I received the -- her findings. And it -it astonished me that she had all these findings and all
these invoices that she was looking at, never once asked a
question. All of this could have been resolved had she just
said to us, hey, I have an invoice here. I don't see tax
paid. Why wasn't it paid? We could have gone over it and we
could have resolved every one of them. We never would have
gotten this far. We could have resolved it right there

because we had the invoice there, but never did that.

And -- and this is -- this is what -- what frustrated me in that never once has the auditor or her supervisor or any appeals person ever came back and said, hey, look at these invoices that we looked at. These didn't have tax and they should have had tax. Never once did that happen, and that's what we tried to do with this exhibit was go back and figure out should these invoices have tax or not.

The client was running -- unfortunately was running three businesses at the same time through the same corporation. He was doing construction. He was doing -- he was servicing pools doing, like, going out and servicing the pools, and he was -- and he had a little store in his -- in his office -- in his -- where his office was. He had a building and he had a little retail store that he would sell some, you know, some products to -- for -- for pools.

And so the way the client had everything set up on his purchases was with his vendors. He would have different accounts. One account was -- was retail account. One account was wholesale account. So he would, you know, purchase and tell the vendor what he was purchasing for and then they would invoice. They would charge him tax or didn't charge him tax, whatever, whichever way it was supposed to go.

And -- and I'm not saying that everything was

perfect, but we could have resolved all this. We had every invoice there. And then -- and then later on they came back with this -- what is that called that -- that test that they do -- okay -- to me it's so abstract because if you have a big -- anywhere you have, you know, a controller who's really an accountant who really understands bookkeeping and you can come up with a pretty good set of books where your cost of goods sold is pretty good and everything, you, know is in let's say in proper place.

For our purposes, this is a client that, you know, barely had a bookkeeper. I mean, did have a bookkeeper who kept books through Quick Books but, you know, she's not really trained other than she knows how to use Quick Books. And so for our purposes all these years, you know, we're just doing a tax return for them. We're not auditing any books. We're not doing any financial things. We're doing a tax return.

The IRS doesn't care if you put something into cost of goods sold or you put into operating expense. If it's a deduction, it's a deduction. They're never going to make a -- a different determination to say that, you know, you put your operating expenses in cost of goods sold, or you put your cost of goods sold in operating expense, and that's what this test is -- is kind of doing is that it's getting -- it's misleading by the fact that -- that, you know, maybe the

books aren't perfect.

I mean, we had some other differences with the different auditors that, you know, through appeal we got reversed, but one of the main things that -- that they came up with this is when I was -- was looking at this is that on -- on this test it never took -- it never took out the service route invoices, so the test is -- is showing them as if they're -- they all should have been taxable and -- and it's not true.

So, I mean, that is why I gave this last invoice because that's what this -- this invoice relates to. It relates to -- to the service route and that -- that it was -- it was a non-taxable event. So, you know, I'm going through and I'm looking at this test and I'm just -- think, you know, this -- this is somebody's abstract way of -- of trying to figure out what the taxable purchases should be, but we went back and looked at the actual stuff and came up with a vastly different number.

I can't believe that -- that anybody can say that we can -- we can do a test that's not based on facts or purely facts. You know, it's -- it's based on something that we perceive as being factual as opposed to looking at the actual invoices. Because that's really the determination of whether something is taxable or not. You look at the invoice and you say they purchased materials or something that they're not

going to resell, that they're using for themselves and they should have paid tax on it, or -- or it's something that, you know, some of this stuff was for services, so there's no tax on it.

2.4

So I -- that, you know, that was the way they did the audit originally. But then they -- then they -- they kind of switched when we asked them about this listing of -- of invoices and how they came up with it.

So -- I don't know. I look at this test and -- and I -- I found so many errors in it that I can't -- I just can't trust it. And -- and that's what -- and that's what they're basing their whole -- their whole argument on whether the taxes is due or not due. And so that's why we went back and we looked at every invoice.

You know, some of -- I asked the client to go back and I gave them the listing of the invoices that the -- that the auditor came up with. I asked them to try and find them. Some of them they couldn't even find. I don't know where they came up with -- with these things from. So, you know, I just -- I look at this and -- and -- and -- and said -- and I've argued this thing from -- from day one that this test just doesn't make sense. It just doesn't make sense, so -- so that's -- so that's kind of where my position is on this.

JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you very much. Let me start with a quick question, Mr. Moser.

MR. MOSER: Uh-huh.

JUDGE BROWN: Looking at your Exhibit 1, I wanted to ask about the part that you had labeled "miscategorized."

MR. MOSER: Yeah. That was their way of saying it was miscategorized in cost of goods sold and it shouldn't have been in cost of goods sold. That -- that's what they went back.

JUDGE BROWN: So --

MR. MOSER: It's not -- doesn't have anything to do with whether it's taxable or non-taxable.

JUDGE BROWN: That's what I was trying to figure out.

MR. MOSER: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. No. She -- yeah.

Well, this is part of the problem of dealing with people who really aren't accountants but they're trying to do accounting work. But, yeah. But that was with her -- that's what she was -- because -- because what I asked her to do was I asked her -- because this test is based on cost of goods sold, I asked her to go back into her general ledger and -- and adjust the items that were not -- that were in the cost of goods sold in the general ledger but should not have been in cost of goods sold.

And so that's what she put -- that's what her miscategorization is. It's for the items that should not be part of cost of goods sold. And the other -- and her -- the first page of that listing is all the items that should be in

1 cost of goods sold. 2 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. So what is your argument as to 3 how -- if -- if we agreed that these items were 4 miscategorized, how would that affect the tax -- the taxable 5 measure? MR. MOSER: Well, no, the -- that has nothing to do --6 7 that's just -- that -- that has nothing to do with whether the tax is right or wrong. I mean, what it will do is this 8 9 cost accountability test will get adjusted for it because the 10 cost of goods sold is -- is -- is wrong. But that's -but that -- but that miscategorization that was really for my 11 purpose and not for -- I just -- I -- I shouldn't -- I 12 13 probably shouldn't -- I probably should have just taken it out when I sent over the thing. It has nothing to do with 14 15 whether something is taxable or not taxable. 16 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Then I will turn to my 17 co-panelists and ask if they have any questions for 18 Appellant. Judge Geary? 19 JUDGE GEARY: I'd like to reserve my questions until 20 after the Department gives its presentation please. 21 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Thank you. And, Judge Wong, do you 22 have any questions at this time? 23 I just had one question. Excuse me. JUDGE WONG: 24 You had mentioned that you had kept invoices in your office

but then you asked the auditor whether you could return them

25

to the client; is that correct?

2.4

MR. MOSER: Yes. When the -- when the original audit happened, the client had brought over all -- because we were doing the audit in our office so the client had brought over the boxes of all his purchase invoices. And so, yeah, we had like six or eight boxes in the office, and that's what the auditor went through those invoices to, I assume, to come up with her listing, but I -- she was there for weeks.

JUDGE WONG: And then you returned the boxes to the client?

MR. MOSER: Yeah. I -- I asked her before I returned them -- because we had them in our office and we didn't really have a big office. We didn't have a lot of room for them -- but I asked her before I returned them, do you have any questions? Is it okay for me to return them? She never, you know -- I never got any feedback from her. I never got any questions from her on anything that she did. And -- and I found that really unusual.

I'm an auditor. Okay. We do a lot of auditing. And if I find -- if I find a problem, I go to the client right away and ask them because -- because how does an outside person really know anything that, you know, unless they, you know, ask the people who deal with this all the time?

JUDGE WONG: Do you know what the client did with the

1 boxes of invoices after you returned them to your client, if 2 you know? MR. MOSER: Well, I mean, I just assumed he keeps them 3 4 filed somewhere. 5 JUDGE WONG: Okay. 6 MR. MOSER: I mean, they were -- they were in such a way 7 that -- I doubt it, like, he would have taken the stuff out and re-did -- you know, because they were -- they 8 were labeled. It was all labeled --9 10 JUDGE WONG: All right. MR. MOSER: -- on the outside. 11 12 JUDGE WONG: Thank you. No further questions. 13 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Now we will switch to 14 allow CDTFA's presentation. CDTFA, you have up to 30 15 minutes. 16 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Thank you, Judge. 17 18 PRESENTATION 19 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Appellant is a California 20 Corporation that operates a construction business since 21 May 1st, 2009, in Sherman Oaks, California. 22 construction contractor, Appellant furnish and installs 23 swimming pools and spas and related fixtures and equipment. 2.4 Appellant also provides maintenance and repair 25 services. In late 2010 Appellant opened a retail store --

THE REPORTER: I didn't understand you.

2.4

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Okay. In late 2010, Appellant opened a retail store at the business location to sell pool and spa related supplies and merchandise. During the audit period, Appellant purchased merchandise in three ways. Some purchases were week sales tax paid to the vendors. Some purchases from out of state vendors were made without sales or used tax paid, and some purchases from California vendors were sales for resale using a resale certificate.

The construction contracts for furnishing and installing swimming pools and spas and related fixtures and equipment --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I apologize.

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: -- were either on a lump sum basis, all on time and material, plus sales tax basis. As a retail store, Appellant recorded sales on its point of sale system. The Department audited Appellant's business for the period of April 1st, 2010, through March 31st, 2013.

During the audit period, Appellant reported around 2.1 million as total sales and claimed around 18,000 as non-taxable labor and around 1.9 million as other deductions resulting in reported taxable sale of around --

THE REPORTER: Border taxable --

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: -- resulting in reported taxable sale of around 257,000.

THE REPORTER: My apologies.

2.4

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: It's all right. And that will be on your Exhibit A, pages 18 and 19. Appellant did not report any purchases that was subject to used tax for the audit period. During the audit, Appellant failed to provide complete purchase and sales records such as job contracts, cost files for individual job performed, sales invoices, POSA's download with all related folders from his POS system, sales receipts, and credit card sales receipt to support its reported sale for the audit period.

As a result, Appellant could not provide a declared support to demonstrate how it reported its sales on its sales and used tax returns, specifically what sources it relied upon. The Department completed three --

THE REPORTER: I apologize. I didn't get that sentence.

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: The Department completed three verification methods to evaluate the reasonableness of Appellant's reported total sales, taxable sales, and purchases subject to used tax.

The Department was unable to verify Appellant's taxable sales and purchases subject to used tax using a direct audit approach. Ultimately, the Department used the cost accountability test to determine the unreported taxable measure that was subject to used tax for the audit period.

First, the Department compared the reported

taxable sales for years 2010 and 2011 with a gross receipts reflected on Appellant's corresponding Federal Income Tax Returns and calculated the taxable sales percentage less than one percent, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 50.

However, based on the analysis of audited taxable sales and purchases, the Appellant's overall audited taxable sales and purchase percentage are a little over three percent, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 50.

Second, Appellant did not report any purchases subject to used tax for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 18. However, based on Appellant's purchase records, Appellant's X-tax materials, fixtures, and equipment purchases for more than \$900,000 for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit D, pages 207 through 228.

Third, the Department reviewed Appellant's Federal Income Tax Return for years 2010 and 2011 and audit net loss of around \$4,000 in year 2010 and low net income of around \$4,100 in year 2011. And that will be on your Exhibit A, page 50.

The Department compared the gross receipt

Appellant reported on his Federal Income Tax Returns in years

2010 and 2011 with Appellant's reported total sale of around

\$75,000 for the same period and calculated an overall

difference of around 7.7 million, and that will be on your

Exhibit A, page 50.

The Department also compared the reported total sale of around \$75,000 to the purchases of around 3.4 million reflected on Appellant's available Federal Income Tax Returns and calculated an overall negative reported book markup of around 98 percent, and that will be on your Exhibit D, page 52.

The total purchases of 3.4 million is also more than 45 times larger than the reported total sale of around \$75,000. Appellant explained that for the first ten quarters its reported total sales are net of contract sales but did not provide the source of the reported amount. For the last two quarters, Appellant reported total sales that included contracts sale of around 1.9 million that were claimed as deductions for non-taxable labor and contract sales, and that will be on your Exhibit A, pages 18 and 19.

In general, Appellant is liable for taxes on materials used in lump sum construction contracts. If Appellant did not pay sales tax on the purchase of the material, then Appellant would owe used tax on those items when it consumed them and used them to fulfill the construction contracts.

Seemingly, Appellant is generally liable for tax on fixtures and equipment it used in lump sum contracts. If Appellant did not pay sales tax on the purchases of those

items, then Appellant would owe used taxes on those items when it used them in fulfilling the construction contracts; therefore, in regard to construction contracts, the Department considered Appellant to be the consumer of material in store in lump sum contracts, the retail of fixtures installed in lump sum contracts, and the retail of equipment in store in lump sum contracts.

2.4

The Department ordered the Appellant did not maintain cost files for each individual job performed.

During the audit period, Appellant purchases include some purchases with tax reimbursement paid to the vendor and others purchase without tax, and that will be on your Exhibit D, pages 157 through 228.

As such, materials and supplies that were purchased without payment of sales tax reimbursement to the vendors and consumed in fulfilling contracts on lump sum basis are subject to used tax.

As stated earlier, Appellant has not reported any material purchases subject to used tax on its sales and used tax return for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 18.

The Department therefore performed a cost accountability test to identify any unreported used tax liability, and that will be on your Exhibit A, pages 47 through 49.

Cost accountability test is an audit procedure performed on a taxable measure basis in which all material costs are accounted for. The Department performed this test to determine whether the Appellant has reported the correct measure of tax on materials, fixtures, and equipment in store in construction contracts.

The Department examined Appellant's purchase journals and available purchase invoices for the period April 1st, 2010, through December 31st, 2012, and that will be on your Exhibit D, pages 157 through 228.

Based on the available purchase information, the Department calculated purchases of materials, fixtures, and equipment of around two million that was comprised of 1.1 million in purchases with tax paid to the vendors and around 909,000 in purchases without payment of tax, and that will be on your Exhibit D, pages 157 through 228.

Based on the available beginning and ending inventory amounts, the Department calculated an adjusted total purchase cost of around 1.8 million, and that will be on your Exhibit A, pages 47 through 49.

The Department reduced this amount by 1.1 million for tax paid purchases to calculate around \$658,000 for purchases without tax paid to the vendors and consumed in fulfilling lump sum contract for the period April 1st, 2010, through December 31st, 2012, and that will be on your

Exhibit A, pages 47 through 49.

2.4

The Department determined that all retail sales relating to time and material contracts and all in-store retail sales were from tax paid inventory of materials, fixtures, and equipment and therefore sales tax was due only on the gross profit on retail sales, and that will be on your Exhibit C, pages 106 through 120.

From the sales journals, the Department calculated the retail sale of materials, fixtures, and equipment under time and material, plus tax contracts of around \$124,000, and retail store sale of around \$189,000 with a total of around \$313,000 in retail sales for the period April 1st, 2010, through — through December 31th, 2012, and that will be on your Exhibit C, page 106.

The Department performed a shelf test of over-the-counter sales by comparing the selling prices on the sales report for the period June 15th, 2013 through June 30th, 2013. The shelf test resulted in an overall markup of around 30 percent, and that will be on your Exhibit C, pages 121 to 126.

The Department then used the total retail sale of materials, fixtures, and equipment from Appellant's time and material, plus sales tax contracts and from Appellant's retail store sales to determine the cost of purchases of around \$240,000 and gross profit of around \$73,000 for the

period April 1st, 2010, through December 31, 2012, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 48.

The Department used a calculated X-tax purchases of around \$658,000 and gross profit of around \$73,000 to calculate Appellant's audited taxable measure of around \$731,000 for the same period, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 48.

Audited taxable measure was compared with the reported taxable sale of around \$216,000 to calculate the unreported taxable items of around \$515,000 for the period of April 1st, 2010, through December 31st, 2012, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 48.

Unreported taxable items were compared with the reporter taxable sales to calculate the percentage of error of around 239 percent for the same period, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 48.

The Department then applied the percentage of error of around 239 percent to the reported taxable sale of around \$257,000 to determine the unreported taxable item of around \$614,000 for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 46.

Had the Department used the audited X-tax purchases of materials, fixtures, equipment of around \$909,000 without considering the total purchases of materials, fixtures, and equipment of around two million to

determine unreported purchases subject to used tax, this would increase the unreported taxable purchases subject to used tax by around \$164,000 from around \$614,000 to \$778,000, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 46 and Exhibit D, page 157.

2.4

The audit calculation of X-tax purchases of materials, fixtures, and equipment based on the cost accountability test was reasonable and was in Appellant's favor, since it was the lowest of the differences determined. Ultimately, the Department used an audit method which yield the lowest deficiency measure to give a benefit to the Appellant.

As mentioned earlier, Appellant did not provide documents that were requested so the Department could directly calculate the unreported X-tax purchases subject to used tax. Appellant did not provide cost files for each individual job performed. Appellant did not report any purchases subject to used tax, and the Department was unable to determine the unreported purchases subject to used tax using a direct audit method; therefore, cost accountability test was used to determine unreported used tax.

Accordingly, the Department determined the unreported tax based upon the best available information.

The evidence shows that the audit produced fair and reasonable sales. Appellant contends that the audit results

are not accurate and it should be adjusted. Appellant also contends that it completed hundred percent review of his purchase information and request the Department to accept Appellant's finding.

2.4

As supposed, Appellant provided the same general ledger information that was previously provided during the audit field work, and that will be on your Exhibit 1 and Exhibit D, pages 157 through 206.

Yesterday Appellant provided 13 purchase invoices and a transaction detail for some of his vendors, and that will be on your Exhibit 2. This information was available for the audit staff during the field work. This purchase information also excluded from total purchases of materials, fixtures, and equipment of two million and audited X-tax purchases of materials, fixtures, and equipment of around \$909,000, and that will be on your Exhibit D, pages 158 through 228.

As stated earlier, had the Department used the audited X-tax purchases of materials, fixtures, and equipment of around \$909,000 without considering the total purchases of materials, fixtures, and equipment of around two million to determine unreported purchases subject to used tax, this would increase the unreported purchases subject to used tax by around \$164,000, and that will be -- that will be on your Exhibit D, page 46 and Exhibit D, page 157.

Therefore, the Department rejects Appellant's argument and the Department find that the amount assessed in this audit is not only reasonable but benefits the Appellant. Before the prehearing conference, Appellant also contended that there are some calculation errors in the cost accountability test that the adjusted error rate should be 212 percent and that Appellant is entitled to relief of interest due to unreasonable delay in processing of these audit, and that will be on your Exhibit K.

2.4

Since Appellant has not stated any specific errors in the cost accountability test, the Department rejected this contention. The Department was not able to verify the Appellant's proposed error rate of 212 percent, and that will be on your Exhibit I, page 321. Therefore, the Department rejected the second contention.

Appellant request relief of interest due to unreasonable delays in processing of these audit. The Department performed an analysis of the case and this specific time spent during the audit appeals and settlement process, and that will be on your Exhibit J.

Reimbursement review, the Department recommends relief of interest for the periods of December 1st, 2013, through December 31st, 2013; May 1st, 2014, through June 30th, 2014; August 1st, 2015, through October 31st, 2015; August 1st, 2017, to September 31st, 2017; June 1st,

2019 through August 31st, 2019; and October 1st, 2019 through January 31st, 2020, for a total of 15 months.

The Department request a request for relief of interest form signed under penalty of perjury for this recommendation to take effect. Appellant has not provided any reasonable documentation or if he chose to support any additional adjustment to the audit finding; therefore, for all of these reasons the Department request the appeal be denied. This concludes our presentation. We are available to answer any questions the Panel may have. Thank you.

JUDGE BROWN: Thank you. Now, we may have questions from the panel. Judge Geary, would you like to begin with any questions?

JUDGE GEARY: Sure. For -- for the Department first.

Did the Department assume that all retail sales either in conjunction with time and material contracts or retail store sales were from tax paid inventory?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yes.

JUDGE GEARY: Why?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: The -- even -- the -- based on the -- based on the information we recovered -- I mean, we -- based on the information we had, the Appellant did not maintain any cost files, and the only information that the Department had is retail sales, and we -- the -- the Department was unable to -- to identify whether -- whether

the retail sales were -- came from tax paid purchases or X-tax purchases.

And we used the actual retail sales and actual material and material -- for materials, fixtures, and equipment using lump sum contracts and identify the -- the total -- total sales and the -- the most effective way to -- to identify the unreported taxable purchases by using the audit that we use.

And, like, also during the audit period we identify the actual X-tax purchases, \$909,000. So if -- if -- if you -- if he used the actual -- actual X-tax purchases the -- the number should be 164,000 --

THE REPORTER: The number -- what?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: If he use that actual X-tax purchases of hundred -- 909,000 and adjusted for opening and ending inventory and compare that to the reported sales, then the number is more than what we have for these audit even if he -- if he didn't take 73,000 gross profit into consideration.

So the -- the -- the way -- the way we did the cost accountability, you know, our objective to identify the X-tax purchases but actually we have -- we have actual X-tax purchases on actual basis on Exhibit -- Exhibit D, page 207 through 228. The -- the -- by using the cost accountability test actually we gave a huge benefit for the taxpayer by not

1 paying \$664,000, so the -- it is our position the way we 2 approach the audit by assuming all the -- all the retail 3 sales that came from tax paid purchases is reasonable. 4 JUDGE GEARY: So --5 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Sorry. 6 JUDGE GEARY: -- let me just -- so by assuming that all 7 retail sales were sales of tax paid purchases, it actually 8 benefited the taxpayer. 9 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yes. 10 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. Same regarding any -- a similar 11 assumption made with respect to the ending inventory; 12 correct? 13 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yes. Because we can identify 14 the -- because based on the accountability test, we already 15 have the -- the opening inventory and we have the two million purchases and we have ending inventory 200 something. 16 it -- if the computer percentage, like, opening inventory and 17 18 divided by the purchases to compute the opening inventory 19 percentage and if he do the same thing to compute the ending 20 inventory percentage and apply those two percentages to 909,000, then we have opening tax -- X-tax inventory and also 21 22 ending X-tax inventory. 23 If he -- if he applied those adjusted numbers,

JUDGE GEARY: Is it your understanding, Department, that

then the unreported taxable should be more than 164,000.

24

25

the items included in purchases did not include charges for services?

2.

2.4

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: That's right. And it -- the easiest way to verify it, we already had the Federal Income Tax purchases. If you -- if you go to our -- our page 50 of Exhibit A, in 2010, the purchases for the whole 12 months purchases is 1.9 million. And for -- for 2011 is 1.4 million.

And if you -- and if you compare that to the Schedule 12-C, that is Exhibit D, page 157, the total purchases we used for the material accountability test is 585,000 versus 1.4 million. And in the audit paper specifically says we make adjustment for sub-contracts, services and also the -- the Appellant provided the detail listing yesterday. And -- and before the hearing we reviewed that information there about a little over ten -- ten vendors. Those vendors were not listed in our total purchases listed in Schedule C of -- that is Exhibit D, page -- pages 158 through 206.

JUDGE GEARY: You're referring to the exhibits that were not admitted today?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yeah. Like, I was referring to as Exhibit 2 and the -- like, I can give you exactly --

JUDGE GEARY: That won't be necessary.

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Okay.

1 Some questions for the Appellant. JUDGE GEARY: 2 Mr. Moser, does your -- does your client contend that the 3 items identified as purchases of tangible personal property 4 made without the payment of tax to the vendor are not 5 accurate? 6 MR. MOSER: Yes. That listing -- that listing of the 7 X-tax purchases? JUDGE GEARY: 8 Yes. Which I think is the original 9 Schedule C, 12-C. 10 MR. MOSER: Yeah. We don't think that that was -- that 11 that's accurate. 12 JUDGE GEARY: And have -- have you or has your client submitted to the Department, either during the audit or in 13 14 the course of this appeal, an invoice that shows that the --15 that any given entry on that schedule does not accurately 16 state an amount paid by your client for tangible personal 17 property? 18 And originally they had every invoice, MR. MOSER: Yes. 19 so if they had a question -- if they came to an invoice and 20 they said no tax was paid but we think tax should have been 21 paid, they had the opportunity -- I was 50 feet away from 22 this auditor. She could have came to me and said, hey, I 23 have this invoice. I think tax should have been paid, and it 2.4 shows that it's not paid. So why wasn't it paid?

We could have then got gone back to the client and

25

tried and figured out why no tax was paid, and we could have then determined whether she's right, we're right. But that was never done. And -- and I -- and I -- that's why I -- I had the client, you know, I -- this one invoice that I submitted today shows that. It shows that this should not have been tax on here. It wasn't taxed on here. It's on their X-tax listing.

So they had -- I mean, we've talked about this for years, this whole thing. And why they didn't do this, I cannot figure out. And, you know, this goes a little bit to the rebuttal, but they're sitting there saying that we didn't provide all the documentation. We provided everything that they asked for.

Now, I will say that in a perfect world, there's some things that they probably asked for that just weren't available. But everything that we could have provided, we provided, and we provided every invoice. I mean, what's more direct than looking at the invoices of the purchases and determining whether there should be tax or no tax?

JUDGE GEARY: Let me interrupt you for a second.

MR. MOSER: Sure.

JUDGE BROWN: And try to focus this discussion. You have said in your argument and you've said in response to my question that -- that you or your client or both think it was inappropriate for the auditor to look at an invoice, observe

that it involved the purchase of tangible personal property, and to observe that it showed no payment of tax by your client.

2.4

Why -- why do you think the auditor would have to ask you about it if the information is right there in front of the auditor?

MR. MOSER: Because it's -- it's not that simple.

They -- they were purchasing items properly without tax and they were purchasing items with tax. They had a retail store. The items that they purchased with the retail store did not have to have tax on it because they're charging tax to the ultimate person they're selling to.

JUDGE GEARY: I understand that. I -- but -- but why do you think -- I don't think that the Department disputes that it was entirely within your client's rights to pay tax on some items and not pay tax on other items, but are you suggesting that the payment of tax by your client determines whether or not your client owes tax on those items?

Let me ask you this. If your client buys a pool filter and pays tax on it and then sells that pool filter at a profit to a customer, does your client -- do you believe your client owes tax on any of the amount your client receives in payment for that pool filter?

MR. MOSER: Well, I think the profit portion may have -JUDGE GEARY: And don't you think that's what the

1 Department did with respect to retail sales of items that 2 were purchased by your client tax paid? 3 MR. MOSER: No. 4 JUDGE GEARY: All right. MR. MOSER: I -- no, I don't -- not -- not from the 5 6 listing that's there. 7 JUDGE GEARY: Does the evidence that you've submitted, does it -- referring to that evidence, and I'm not talking 8 9 about spreadsheets. I'm talking about -- because we don't 10 know the source of information on some spreadsheets, but can you -- can you point to any specific entry on the 11 12 Department's schedule of purchases that is wrong because the 13 Department included in the -- in the taxable measure either 14 because it's used tax owed on the purchase price -- you do 15 agree, by the way, that your client would owe used tax on 16 tangible personal property purchased and consumed by your 17 client; correct? 18 MR. MOSER: Yes. 19 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. And you also agree that your client 20 owed -- owed sales tax on the profit it made from TPP 21 purchase, tangible personal property purchase tax paid 22 because you just said you agreed with that. 23 MR. MOSER: Correct. 24 JUDGE GEARY: Can you point to any entry on the 25 Department's schedule of purchases, either tax paid purchases

1 or X-tax purchases, where the Department incorrectly included 2 the -- either the purchased price or the profit and the 3 taxable measure and then point us to an invoice that shows 4 the Department was wrong? 5 MR. MOSER: Yeah. Let me -- I forget the page numbers 6 for the X-tax listing. Do you guys know the X-tax listing 7 page number? 8 MR. PARKER: The X-tax purchases is in Schedule 12-D 9 which is part of Exhibit D. And it's pages 207 through 228. 10 JUDGE GEARY: I have that schedule in front of me, and if you can -- if there is an entry on that schedule that you 11 12 think your evidence establishes an error. 13 MR. MOSER: Yeah. If you look at this invoice dated 8/09. 14 15 JUDGE GEARY: A line number would probably help me 16 better. 17 MR. MOSER: Okay. What was -- let me find the listing. 18 207. 19 I'm sorry. I didn't hear that. JUDGE GEARY: 20 MR. MOSER: It's page 207. 21 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. And give me a line number. 22 JUDGE BROWN: I believe -- did you say 207 or 227? 23 MR. PARKER: It's page 207 through page 228. I should

MR. MOSER: Yeah, at the bottom. I got this from --

clarify. That's the BATES stamp page number.

2.4

25

1 this page 112, this retail and service invoices which --2 JUDGE GEARY: Let me just interrupt you. Mr. Moser, 3 when you say page 112, is it --4 MR. MOSER: The stamp number. 5 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. Give me a minute to get there. 6 Okay. 7 JUDGE BROWN: And you mean 112 in CDTFA's exhibits? MR. MOSER: Yes. 8 9 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. 10 MR. MOSER: It says "Retail and Service Invoices." JUDGE GEARY: Okay. I'm on 112. The first line number 11 12 on that page is 109. Is that the right one? 13 MR. MOSER: Yes. So if you look at 115. 14 JUDGE GEARY: 115, \$37,330. 15 MR. MOSER: Which shows that it's put into the X-tax 16 listing, but it's not an X-tax. 17 JUDGE GEARY: And you know this because what? 18 MR. MOSER: I have the invoice. 19 JUDGE GEARY: Is that the invoice? 20 It should -- it should be X-tax, but it was MR. MOSER: 21 added back in as taxable. 22 JUDGE GEARY: It sounds -- are you -- when you -- when 23 you say "but it's taxable," you mean --2.4 MR. MOSER: It's not taxable, but it was added back in 25 on their calculations that it should have been taxable.

JUDGE GEARY: I'm confused. And let me ask you for some clarification. Is it your contention that line item 115 an invoice for \$37,330.00 is -- appears on the schedule for retail and service invoices 2012, and is it your contention that that \$37,330.00 is included in the schedule of TPP purchases that are subject to tax either on costs or profit?

MR. MOSER: Yes.

JUDGE GEARY: All right. Let me interrupt my questions to you and go to Mr. Samarawickrema, and ask you, sir, is that -- is that amount included in the Department's measure of tax?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: No, because that's a sale invoice and not the purchases. That listed the sale invoices for that particular year. And the purpose of that schedule is to identify what the retail sales and the material, equipment, and -- material, equipment, and fixtures using lump sum contracts. So the Department did similar test for all three years to identify retail sales of material, fixtures, and equipment and this is not -- this is sale invoices.

MR. PARKER: Judge Geary, I'd just like to add something real quick is that I think where the Appellant's representative is getting confused is our audit is conducted -- basically the measure is solely derived from purchase invoices, and he has always provided sales invoices saying they're not subject to tax. The invoice that he

1 provided that he points out, we agreed that it's not subject 2 to tax but it has no bearing on the adjustment to the 3 purchases of -- or the X-tax purchases on Schedule 12-D. 4 JUDGE GEARY: Because it's not included in those 5 purchases. Well, it's a sale and not a purchase. 6 MR. PARKER: 7 JUDGE GEARY: Right. MR. PARKER: 8 Correct. 9 JUDGE GEARY: Do you understand that, Mr. Moser? 10 MR. MOSER: Well, I understand what you're saying, but I 11 don't necessarily agree. But you can go on. 12 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. Is there any other -- is there any 13 other particular amount included on the Department's 14 schedules of X-tax purchases or tax -- or tax included 15 purchases that you think should not have been included in the taxable measure? 16 17 MR. MOSER: I don't have any detail on it. 18 JUDGE GEARY: Thank you. Those are all the questions I 19 have. 20 Thank you very much. And, Judge Wong, do JUDGE BROWN: 21 you have any questions? 22 I have no questions, thank you. JUDGE WONG: 23 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Give me just a moment. All right. 2.4 I think that I will say that we can move onto Appellant's 25 rebuttal, if you are ready, Mr. Moser. If you need a minute,

that's fine.

MR. MOSER: No, I'm fine. That's fine. I can go.

JUDGE BROWN: You can go ahead with your rebuttal and -- yeah, thank you.

2.4

2.

CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. MOSER: Okay. So part of what the Department said was we refused to show some records which -- which was not true. We provided all the records that they asked for that were available.

Now, I will admit that there were some records that they asked for that were not available partly due to, to timing, partly due to my client not fully understanding his record retention, and so there was some records that we -- that we couldn't provide. But -- but everything they -- they asked for -- there was nothing that they asked for that we couldn't provide a sampling of.

They asked for point of sales invoice -- not invoices but records that -- to show the sales for whole three-year period that it -- the client had changed their point of sales equipment and so all the records were not available, but we were able to provide a test for -- for the period which they did.

So their whole contention is that they had to use this cost accountability test because they couldn't get

records. I -- I find it hard to understand if you have every single invoice in your possession how you can't use a direct auditing method and why you have to then go to some other record, some other way of testing. I just -- I don't -- I don't understand that, and it's something I've never understood for the last ten years.

2.4

They talked about time and material contracts. I'm not really sure there were any time and material contracts. I think they're really talking about the route sales. They talk about -- they talked about that we couldn't show them how the -- the sales tax reports were -- were calculated. We did go through the way it was calculated, and we gave the auditors at -- at some time the backup that the client used.

Now, I will admit that the client did not prepare the returns properly because they didn't understand, and I find this with a lot of clients, they don't understand that they're supposed to report hundred percent of their sales and then take a deduction for their non-taxable sales. So, yes, they only reported the taxable sales on their sales tax return probably up to the time of the audit, maybe after that then we straightened them out on that. But we did give them the detail. The client did have records of how they made the calculation, and we did send them that — that information.

And let me see -- well, I mean, some of the stuff

that he was talking about I couldn't really follow because I couldn't get to the pages fast enough. But -- but my main contention is that this cost accountability test I don't think is accurate because I don't know that the books and records are as accurate as they need to be for that test in terms of what's in cost of goods sold, what's in what purchases where they are on the -- on the general ledger and stuff or -- so -- but if you have every invoice I just -- I just don't understand how you don't use that and say, okay, I looked at every invoice. Let's determine if tax should have been paid on it or not. I don't know.

2.4

I mean, I don't know. I do a lot of auditing and that's the way I do my auditing. If I have -- if I come up to a question I go to the client and ask them, hey, what happened? I don't -- I can't make a determination and put it in a financial statement and say, hey, this client did all these things wrong because that's my determination. I have to ask them. And that's really what should have happened here. They had the records.

You know, to say they didn't have the records is -- is completely false because they had all the purchase invoices. I mean, you're telling me that someone sat in my office for three weeks and wasn't looking at anything?

So that's -- that's what I don't understand. But -- and I'm not trying to say that -- that their number should be zero.

Okay. I just want -- I'll -- I'll admit that there were errors in here.

2.

2.2

2.4

You know, the client did try and keep a distinction between what they were purchasing with tax for the store and what they were purchasing for their construction business. But, you know, you call up a vendor and you say, hey, send me whatever, you know, sometimes the vendor makes mistake. Sometimes you make the mistake. Whatever happen.

I'm not trying to say that everything is perfect here, but I just don't think that this -- this number is accurate.

JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Thank you very much. And I did allow an extra few minutes if CDTFA had any final response, in addition to what we've already heard from you. You do not need to repeat anything.

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: We have nothing to add.

JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Just a minute. All right then. I can say that that concludes the hearing. The record is closed and the case is submitted except for the Appellant's submission of the written request for relief of interest.

Mr. Moser, it can be signed by you or it can be signed by your client. But as I said, it does have to be under penalty of perjury and you indicated you would submit

it to OTA with a copy to CDTFA one week from today, and I don't know if we need any time for response from CDTFA.

MR. PARKER: We've already gone over the months that we're willing to concede.

JUDGE BROWN: Right.

MR. PARKER: I don't see -- I don't see a need for a period to respond.

JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Thank you. All right. Then I will say once we -- I guess the problem -- question is for the periods that aren't conceded whether CDTFA would want to respond on those.

MR. PARKER: The Appellant's representative made no argument today about any of the other periods. I would consider this to be the forum to provide that argument. I'm not sure the need for it after the fact. We've already provided all of our analysis and the periods in which we felt there was unreasonable delay, and otherwise the items were being worked so --

JUDGE BROWN: Mr. Moser, you understand that -- the question is for this -- the time period where you're arguing relief of interest and CDTFA has conceded it, if you didn't raise it during your argument today -- and so the question is how, you know, whether CDTFA would have -- whether that period is still at issue, those periods are still at issue and whether CDTFA, you know, if you're not going to raise it

1 now how would they have an opportunity to respond? 2 MR. MOSER: Well, I did raise it. I did raise it, and 3 you said that I needed to put it in writing. 4 JUDGE BROWN: I think we --MR. MOSER: You asked me what periods and I told you, 5 and then you said, well some of that is outside of your 6 7 purview. 8 JUDGE BROWN: Right. But the period after it's left 9 CDTFA --10 MR. MOSER: Yes. 11 JUDGE BROWN: -- the question is -- let me -- hold on. 12 Let me look at the time period. All right. So the time 13 period that is in question that we're talking about here is 14 March, April and -- March through May of 2019 and then 15 September 2019 and then February 2020 through whenever CDTFA's final options letter was issued and --16 17 MR. MOSER: Is that the September period? 18 September 2020? 19 JUDGE BROWN: Well, I think CDTFA's options letter was 20 issued -- hold on -- the option letter was issued 21 August 4th, 2020, so that would be the end date essentially. 22 MR. MOSER: Okay. August. 23 JUDGE BROWN: Now CDTFA conceded, as I said, periods 2.4 within that. 25 MR. MOSER: Right. June through August, and October

1 through January 2020. 2. JUDGE BROWN: Yeah. Is your microphone on, Mr. Moser? 3 MR. MOSER: Yeah. I'm sorry. 4 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. 5 Yeah. I think it's the June 2019 to MR. MOSER: August 2019 and October 2019 to January 2020. 6 7 JUDGE BROWN: Right. So those are the periods conceded. CDTFA is saying they don't need to response to that. 8 9 already conceded it. The question is those other periods 10 that we're talking about. Do you have any argument or 11 evidence that you're pointing to that -- beyond what you're going to put in -- not beyond, but what they're saying is, is 12 13 their -- you didn't arque anything about those periods during 14 your presentation. 15 MR. MOSER: Well, I didn't say anything because you said that I needed to put it in writing. 16 17 JUDGE BROWN: We do need it in writing. 18 MR. MOSER: So I didn't really say much. I mean, this 19 thing was -- this thing was delayed from -- from 2013 to 20 2018. So, you know -- so I'm not really clear as to what 21 periods I'm allowed to get the relief of interest and what my 22 client is allowed to get the relief, you know. 23 mean --2.4 JUDGE BROWN: I will --25 MR. MOSER: -- everything was delayed. I mean, there

1 was no -- from 2013 to -- to 2018 this whole thing was -- was 2 just delayed. 3 Right. And I will point -- I will say --JUDGE BROWN: 4 I will point you to CDTFA's Exhibit F where they have a little chart that their position. 5 I have that. I wasn't --6 MR. MOSER: No. 7 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. All right. What I'm going to say is --8 9 MR. MOSER: Yeah. 10 JUDGE BROWN: -- you're going to submit your request for 11 relief of interest by a week from today. 12 The 22nd. MR. MOSER: 13 JUDGE BROWN: Right. CDTFA, I will leave the record 14 open for if you have any response. We'll set a deadline for 15 which you can respond. And if you think that there's no need to respond, then please let us know and then we will close 16 17 the record. 18 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Okay. 19 JUDGE BROWN: Okay. Do you want two weeks from the 20 submission of the request? 21 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yeah. Two weeks. Is fine. Thank 22 you. 23 Okay. All right. So the record -- I'm JUDGE BROWN: 2.4 going to leave the record open, as I said, one week from

today for Appellant's submission. CDTFA will have two weeks

25

1	to respond, and then the record will be closed. And as I
2	believe I indicated previously, after that once the record is
3	closed the judges will meet and decide the case based on the
4	evidence, arguments, and applicable law, and we will mail
5	both parties our written decision no later than 100 days from
6	today. So
7	MR. MOSER: From the date.
8	JUDGE BROWN: From the date of close. Right. Sorry.
9	MR. MOSER: So that's three weeks.
10	JUDGE BROWN: 100 days from the date the record closes.
11	MR. MOSER: That's about three weeks from today.
12	JUDGE BROWN: Yeah, three weeks from today.
13	MR. MOSER: All right.
14	JUDGE BROWN: Sorry. That's my my default language.
15	So I believe that wraps everything up, and so the hearing is
16	now adjourned. Thank you very much everyone for your
17	participation, and we are off the record.
18	(The Hearing concluded at 4:58 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand, which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given.

Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the original transcript of a deposition in a federal case -- before completion of the proceedings, review of the transcript [] was [] was not requested.

I further certify I am neither financially interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney or party to this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated: MARCH 6, 2023

Marie C. Sanchez, CSR No. 13809
Certified Shorthand Reporter
For The State Of California

i1 Index: \$124,000..55

	46:7	2	23rd 10:15 13:18
\$124,000 38:10	106 38:7,14 109 52:12	2 15:7,8 19:21	257,000 32:25
\$164,000 40:3 41:24	112 52:1,3,7,11	41:11 46:23 2.1 32:20	3
\$189,000 38:11	115 52:13,14 53:2	200 45:16	3.4 35:4,8
\$216,000 39:9	12 46:6	2009 31:21	30 21:13 22:11
\$240,000 38:25	12-C 46:10 47:9	20096720 2:6 5:7	31:14 38:19
\$257,000 39:19	12-D 51:8 54:3	6:13	300 2:16
\$313,000 38:12	120 38:7	2010 31:25 32:2,	30th 38:18 42:24
\$37,330 52:14	121 38:20	18 34:1,17,18,23 37:9,24 38:12	31 4:14 39:1
\$37,330.00 53:3,5	126 38:20	39:1,11 46:6	31st 9:4 10:6,11,
\$4,000 34:18	12900 2:16	2011 34:1,17,19, 23 46:7	25 14:6 15:12 32:18 37:9,25
\$4,100 34:19	13 15:4 41:9	2012 37:9,25	39:11 42:23,24,25
\$515,000 39:10	13809 2:20	38:13 39:1,11	43:1,2
\$614,000 39:20	13th 15:3 19:22	53:4	31th 38:13
40:3	14 4:5	2013 9:1 32:18 38:17,18 42:22,23	321 42:14
\$658,000 37:22 39:4	14th 15:6 19:23	2014 42:23,24	3:10 2:17 5:2
\$664,000 45:1	15 2:19 5:1 8:7	2015 42:24,25	3:13 6:14
\$73,000 38:25	12:6 14:5 18:7 21:24 43:2	2017 42:25	4
39:4	15-day 20:18	2019 8:22 9:3,4	
\$731,000 39:6	157 36:13 37:10,	10:3,5,6 43:1	45 35:9
\$75,000 34:24 35:3,10	16 40:5 41:8,25 46:10	2020 9:4,9 10:3,6 15:16 17:25 43:2	46 39:21 40:4 41:25
\$778,000 40:3	158 41:16 46:19	2022 15:20	47 36:24 37:20
\$900,000 34:13	15th 6:13 38:17	2023 2:19 5:1 6:14	38:1
\$909,000 39:24	164,000 44:12 45:24	7:14 8:23	48 39:2,7,12,16
41:16,20 44:10		206 41:8 46:19	49 36:25 37:20 38:1
1	17th 7:14 14:15 18 33:3 34:11	207 34:14 44:23 51:9,18,20,22,23	4:58 2:18
4 4.5 14.0 12.10	35:16 36:21	21 4:6	5
1 4:5 14:9,13,19, 23,24 16:19,22	18,000 32:20	212 42:7,13	
20:19 28:2 41:7	19 33:3 35:16	22 4:13	50 34:4,8,20 35:1
1.1 37:14,21	1st 31:21 32:18	227 51:22	46:5 47:21
1.4 46:8,12	37:9,24 38:12 39:1,11 42:22,23,	228 34:15 36:13	52 35:7
1.8 37:19	24,25 43:1	37:10,16 41:17 44:24 51:9,23	55 4:21

Index: 585,000..assumption

585,000 46:12	15:17	21:16 22:3	31:19,22,24,25
	actual 19:14	agencies 5:13	32:2,5,16,19 33:3 5,11 34:9,22
7	26:17,22 44:3,10, 11,14,22,23	agency 5:14	35:10,13,17,19, 20,23,25 36:1,4,8
7.7 34:25	add 12:16 53:20	agree 50:15,19 54:11	10,18 37:4 40:12,
73,000 44:18	added 52:21,24	agreed 10:9 29:3	13,16,17,25 41:1, 5,9 42:3,4,7,10,16
735-A 13:20	Addison 2:6 5:6 6:12	50:22 54:1	43:5,22 46:14 47:1
8	addition 10:5	ahead 55:3	Appellant's 14:7
	additional 7:19 8:8 15:3 19:25 20:23 43:7	ALJ 3:3,4,5 5:25 6:17 ALJ's 6:1	22 19:20 20:19 21:12,23 22:10 32:17 33:18,20 34:2,6,11,12,16,
8/09 51:14			
8th 14:17		alleging 9:25	
9	address 9:12		23 35:4 37:7 38:22,23 39:5
	11:9 12:24 13:19 14:8	amount 35:12 37:21 42:2 47:16 49:22 53:10 54:13	40:8 41:4 42:1,13 53:21 54:24
909,000 37:15 44:15 45:21	addressing 12:18	49:22 53:10 54:13 amounts 37:18	appellants' 4:5
98 35:6	adjust 28:19	analysis 34:5	14:24
	adjusted 29:9 37:19 41:1 42:6 44:15 45:23	42:18	applied 39:17
A		Andrew 3:5 5:24 6:18	45:23 apply 45:20
abstract 25:4 26:15	adjustment 43:7	anticipating 20:6	approach 33:22
accept 41:3	46:13 54:2	anymore 23:4,14,	45:2
account 24:19,20	adjustments 7:19	16	approximately 6:14
		apologies 33:1	April 32:18 37:9,
accountability 7:21 29:9 33:23	Administration 3:9 5:15	apologize 32:13 33:15	24 38:12 39:1,11
36:23 37:1 40:8, 20 42:6,11 44:21,	Administrative	appeal 2:5 5:5,18	argued 27:21
24 45:14 46:11	5:8 14:25 21:8	6:12 9:9,11 13:2,7	argument 13:4
55:25 57:3 accountant 25:6	admission 14:12 19:20 20:22 21:2	15:17 26:3 43:8 47:14	20:16 27:12 29:2 42:2 48:23
	admit 20:17,19	appeals 2:1 5:11,	arguments 5:15,
accountants 28:14	55:11 56:15	12 6:11 9:18 13:3	21
accounted 37:3	admitted 5:20	24:4 42:19	assessed 42:2
accounting	14:20,23 19:7 21:6 22:2 46:21	APPEARANCES 3:1	assume 30:7 43:15
28:14	admitting 7:11	appears 53:3	assumed 31:3
accounts 24:19	14:1	Appellant 2:7 3:6	assuming 12:21
accurate 6:5 41:1 47:5,11 57:4,5	advance 15:15, 19,21	7:7,25 8:8 12:7,23 13:2,14 14:9 15:3,	21:1 45:2,6
accurately 47:15	affect 29:4	9,13 17:12 19:4	assumption 45:11
		20:1,15,21 21:1,	4 0.11

CDT 13:1 astonished 23:19 12:5 19:24 20:13 6:16 7:6,9 8:6,11, 26:20,21 28:17 14,17,19,24 9:22 attached 16:2 **CDTFA** 5:16 6:21 34:5,11 37:11,17 10:14,18,21 11:4, 7:3,5 8:2,7,20,25 audit 9:16 16:8 40:7,23 43:20,21, 7,9,16,21 12:1,4, 9:8,10 11:10,11 18:18 22:20,21,22 22 45:14 9,12,15,16,20,22 12:4 13:1,5,6,11 23:5,6 27:6 30:2,4 13:13 14:22 15:1 basically 53:23 14:12,13,16,18 32:4,19 33:4,5,10, 16:17,21,25 17:5, 15:10 17:13 19:1, **basing** 27:12 9,12,16,19,24 22,24 34:10,13,17 19 20:14,20,22 36:10,20 37:1 18:3,21 19:1,18, **basis** 32:14,15 21:5,24 31:14 25 20:12 21:1,4,9 39:20 40:6,10,20, 36:17 37:2 44:23 22:9 27:24 28:2,8, **CDTFA's** 13:6,20 24,25 41:7,12 42:3,9,17,19 43:7 **BATES** 51:24 11 29:2,16,21 14:8 21:18 31:14 31:13 43:11 48:22 44:8,9,17 45:2 52:7 bearing 54:2 51:22 52:7.9 46:12 47:13 53:22 **Cerritos** 2:16 5:1 54:20,23 55:3 56:21 begin 22:4 43:12 6:15 audited 32:17 building 24:15 beginning 37:17 certificate 32:9 34:5,6 39:5,8,22 Bureau 7:3 benefit 40:11 Certified 2:20 41:14,19 44:25 business 15:2 auditing 25:15 changed 13:7 31:20 32:3,17 benefited 45:8 30:19 56:3 57:12, 55:20 businesses benefits 42:3 **charge** 24:22,23 18:12 24:10 auditor 22:24 big 23:12 25:5 charges 46:1 23:1 24:3 27:17 **buys** 49:19 30:13 29:25 30:7,19 charging 49:11 bit 48:10 47:22 48:25 49:4, C Chief 7:2 block 21:19 **chose** 43:6 auditors 9:18 **body** 5:12 calculate 37:22 26:3 56:13 Christopher 3:11 39:5,9,14 40:15 book 35:5 7:4 **audits** 18:16 calculated 34:3, bookkeeper claimed 32:20 24 35:5 37:12,18 **August** 9:3 10:3 25:11 35:14 38:8 39:3 56:12 23:11 42:24,25 bookkeeping 43:1 clarification 6:8 calculation 40:6 25:6 42:5 56:24 53:2 authority 12:25 **books** 25:7,12,13, clarified 13:9 calculations aware 12:25 15 26:1 57:4 52:25 clarify 12:24 **Border** 32:23 California 2:2.17. 51:24 В **bottom** 51:25 21 3:8 5:1,14 6:16 clarifying 13:11 31:19,21 32:8 **back** 13:16 16:4,6 **boxes** 18:13 **client** 16:1 18:3, call 15:7 18:14 23:3,15,16 22:24 23:12 30:5, 24 22:23 23:15 24:4,8 25:2 26:17 6,9 31:1 called 25:3 24:9,17 25:10 27:14,15 28:7,18 27:15 30:1,3,4,10, briefs 5:19 47:25 52:21,24 calling 21:10 20,25 31:1 47:2, **Brooks** 3:11 7:4 **backup** 56:13 card 33:9 12,16,25 48:4,24 19:24 49:3,17,18,19,21, **barely** 25:11 care 22:17 25:18 22 50:2,15,17,19 brought 22:22 **Barry** 3:6 7:8 30:3,4 case 5:7,9,10 55:13,20 56:14, 15,23 57:14,16 6:13,17 13:5 14:6 **based** 5:19 7:20 **Brown** 3:3 5:5,7 15:16 42:18

client's 49:15 condense 21:19 contracts 32:10 17:20 18:6 20:18 33:7 35:14,18,22, **clients** 56:17 conducted 18:18 deal 30:23 24 36:2,3,5,6,7,16 22:21 53:23 **close** 15:2 37:6 38:3,10,23 dealing 28:13 conducting 5:8, 43:16 44:5 53:17 closer 8:12,15 December 9:1 56:7,9 15:20 37:9,25 CLOSING 4:18 conference 7:13, contrary 20:17 38:13 39:1,11 55:6 14,16,17,25 8:4 42:22,23 controller 25:5 10:9,24 13:17 co-panelists **decision** 6:1 9:8 convenient 13:22 5:23 6:17 29:17 14:3,4,11,15 13:2 15:12 18:5 20:21 copies 16:2 coequal 6:1 21:5,11,25 42:4 declared 33:12 cognizant 21:16 **copy** 11:10 confirm 7:10 deduction 25:20 13:13 21:9 corporation 56:19 commencing 2:17 24:11 31:20 confirmed 7:17 deductions 10:16 13:25 14:3 commented 23:9 correct 14:20,21 32:21 35:15 20:24,25 30:1 **confused** 53:1,22 deficiency 40:11 communications 37:4 45:12 50:17, 5:23 9:18 conjunction 23 54:8 **delay** 16:5 18:9 43:16 compare 44:16 42:8 **cost** 7:20 25:7,19, 46:9 consideration 22,23 28:5,6,17, **delays** 42:17 44:19 compared 33:25 19,21,24 29:1,9, demonstrate 10 33:7,23 36:9, 34:21 35:2 39:8, considered 36:4 33:12 22 37:1,19 38:24 40:7,16,20 42:5, denied 43:9 construction comparing 38:16 24:11 31:20,22 11 43:23 44:21,24 Department 3:8 55:25 57:3,6 complete 23:5 32:10 35:18,22 5:15 6:23 7:1 36:2,3 37:6 33:6 costs 37:3 53:6 29:20 32:17 consumed 35:21 33:14,16,20,22,25 completed 33:14, Counsel 7:4 36:16 37:23 50:16 16 41:2 34:16,21 35:2 **couple** 13:18 36:4,8,22 37:3,7, consumer 36:4 completely 57:21 12,18,21 38:2,8, **court** 5:12 comprised 37:13 contacted 23:11, 15,21 39:3,17,22 covered 9:4 40:10,14,18,22 compute 45:18, 41:3,18 42:1,2,11, contained 16:18 credit 33:9 19 12,14,18,21 43:3, contend 19:6 **CSR** 2:20 8,14,15,24,25 computer 45:17 45:25 47:13 49:14 47:2 customer 49:21 con 9:8 50:1,13 51:1,4 contended 42:4 53:17 55:7 conceded 8:2,9, D contends 40:25 21,25 9:2,6 10:1, department's 4:6 41:2 2,4 11:24 12:2,17, 21:7 50:12.25 dated 51:13 53:10 54:13 contention 16:7 42:12,15 53:2,4 conceding 8:7 day 17:17 19:22 derived 53:23 55:24 57:3 9:14,23 27:21 detail 41:10 46:14 contract 35:11,15 concerned 23:4 days 14:5 17:16 54:17 56:23 37:24 18:7 concludes 43:9 determination contractor 31:22 deadline 15:12 25:21 26:23 concluding 2:18

20,21 15:18 43:4

57:15,17 **evidence** 5:16,20 **favor** 40:9 Ε 11:8 14:25 15:14, determine 33:23 **February** 2:19 5:1 19.21 17:13 18:4 37:4 38:24 39:19 6:13 8:23 14:17 19:7 21:8 40:24 **E-MAIL** 11:9 40:1.19.21 41:22 15:3,6 19:22,23 50:7,8 51:12 57:10 **earlier** 18:1 20:2 **Federal** 34:2,16, ex-parte 5:23 36:18 40:13 41:18 determined 38:2 22 35:4 46:4 40:9.22 48:2 examined 37:7 easier 16:1.11 Fee 3:9 5:15 17:3 determines **Excel** 14:10,19 feedback 30:16 49:17 easiest 46:4 excluded 41:13 feet 47:21 determining effect 43:5 **Excuse** 29:23 48:19 field 41:7,12 effective 12:7 exhibit 4:5 14:9. difference 34:25 figure 9:19 24:8 44:6 13,19,23 15:7,8, 26:16 28:11 48:10 differences 26:2 24,25 16:3,12,19, effectively 17:17 40:9 22 19:21 20:19 figured 48:1 end 19:21 23:2 24:7 28:2 33:3 direct 33:22 40:20 filed 9:9 13:2,7 34:4,8,11,14,20 **ending** 37:18 48:18 56:2 15:16 17:24 31:4 35:1,7,16 36:13, 44:16 45:11,16, directly 40:15 21,24 37:10,16,20 **files** 12:21 18:11 19,22 38:1,7,14,20 39:2, 33:7 36:9 40:16 discuss 22:17 engage 5:22 7,12,16,21 40:4 43:23 41:7,8,11,16,25 discussed 7:17 ensure 6:4 filter 49:20,23 8:3 10:8 11:18 42:9,14,20 44:23 entitled 42:7 15:11 21:4,24 46:6,10,18,23 financial 25:16 51:9 57:16 entry 47:15 50:11, discussing 11:12 24 51:11 **exhibits** 4:6 5:20 **find** 13:19 17:21 discussion 48:22 7:12 14:2,5,7,8,9, 18:15,24 27:17,18 equipment 19:16 24 18:22 20:17, disputes 49:14 30:20 42:2 51:17 31:23 32:12 34:13 20,22,23 21:5,7 56:1,17 35:24 36:7 37:5, divided 45:18 22:2 46:20 52:7 13 38:5,9,22 finding 16:4 41:4 document 10:15 39:23,25 40:7 **expense** 25:19,23 43:7 14:14 41:14,15,19,21 expenses 25:22 findings 23:18,19 44:5 53:15,16,19 documentation 55:21 experts 5:13 43:6 48:12 fine 22:1 55:1,2 error 39:14,18 documents 15:1 explained 35:10 fixtures 31:23 42:6,13 51:12 19:6,21 20:3,10, 32:11 34:12 35:24 13,16,23 21:2 36:6 37:5,12 38:5, **errors** 19:10 F 40:14 9.22 39:23.25 23:10 27:10 42:5, 40:7 41:14,15,19, 10 doubt 31:7 fact 25:25 21 44:4 53:16,18 establish 19:7 download 33:8 facts 26:20,21 focus 13:3 18:21 establishes **Drive** 2:16 48:22 **factual** 26:22 51:12 folders 33:8 due 19:12,13,15, failed 33:5 evaluate 33:17 16 27:13 38:5 **follow** 57:1 fair 40:24 42:8,16 55:12,13 **event** 26:13 forget 51:5 **false** 57:21 **events** 21:12 form 12:21 13:19, fast 11:16 57:2

format 16:1 gross 34:1,21 include 9:3 36:10 13 52:18,19 53:3, 38:6,25 39:4 46:1 12,25 55:18 56:2 found 23:10 27:10 44:18 57:8,10 30:18 included 35:13 invoices 15:4 guess 9:7 23:6 46:1 50:13 51:1 **free** 6:2 53:5,10 54:4,13, 16:2,5,7,8 17:5, guys 51:6 front 49:5 51:10 14,15 10,13,22,23 18:15,16,24 19:9, frustrated 24:3 income 34:2,17, Н 12,13 20:11 18,22 35:4 46:4 22:24,25 23:14,20 frustrating 18:17 24:5,8 26:7,23 incorrectly 51:1 **half** 18:4 fulfill 35:21 27:8,16 29:24 increase 40:2 happen 24:7 fulfilling 36:2,16 30:5,7 31:1 33:8 41:23 37:8 41:9 48:18 37:24 happened 22:22 independent 52:1,10 53:4,13, 23:7 30:3 57:15, fully 55:13 19,24 55:19 57:22 5:12,13 18 furnish 31:22 involved 49:1 individual 33:7 hard 9:13 56:1 36:9 40:17 furnishing 32:10 IRS 25:18 **Headquarters** infer 14:18 7:2 **issue** 7:19,21,23 G information 11:12 13:9 22:19 **hear** 51:19 23:8 16:11,18 37:11 gave 26:10 27:16 hearing 5:8,10,21 40:23 41:3,6,11, **issued** 7:14 9:8, 6:1,4,8,9,10,15 44:25 56:13 13 43:21,22,23 10 13:1,17 7:11,12,18 8:11 46:16 49:5 50:10 **Geary** 3:4 5:24 10:20 14:1,6,11 56:24 **issues** 7:10,18 6:18 29:18,19 15:15,20 17:17,24 13:11,25 43:12,14,19 45:4, **initial** 21:20 18:7 22:5 46:15 6,10,25 46:20,24 item 39:19 53:2 installed 36:6 hey 23:22 24:5 47:1,8,12 48:20 items 17:11 49:13,25 50:4,7, 47:22 57:14,16 installing 32:11 28:19,23,25 29:3 19,24 51:10,15, hold 8:24 23:13 installs 31:22 35:20 36:1 39:10, 19,21 52:2,5,11, 13 46:1 47:3 49:8, 14,17,19,22 53:1, holding 6:15 interest 7:22.24 9,10,16,18 50:1 8,20 54:4,7,9,12, 8:1,2,7,20 9:10, **Honor** 11:15 18 20,25 10:8,22,23 huge 44:25 J 11:2,13,19 13:1, general 28:18,20 14,21 21:18 22:15 35:17 41:5 57:7 hundred 41:2 42:8,16,22 43:4 **January** 7:14 9:4 44:15 56:18 generally 35:23 10:3,6,11,15,25 interrupt 48:20 13:18 14:6.15 give 23:15,16 52:2 53:8 ı 15:12 43:2 40:11 46:23 51:21 inventory 37:18 52:5 54:23 56:22 **Jason** 3:10 7:2 identified 9:5.7 38:4 43:17 44:16 **good** 5:5 25:7,8 10:2 47:3 45:11,15,16,17, **job** 33:6,7 36:9 18,20,21,22 40:17 **goods** 25:8,19,22, identify 14:16 23 28:5,6,17,20, 36:23 43:25 44:5, invoice 16:14,15 journals 37:8 21,24 29:1,10 7,10,21 45:13 19:14 20:1,4,8 38:8 57:6 53:15,18 22:22,23 23:22 **Judge** 5:5,8,24 24:1,22 25:2 grant 10:21 11:24 in-store 38:3 6:18 7:6,9 8:6,11, 26:10,11,24 27:14 14,17,19,24 9:22 **green** 8:12 inappropriate 47:14,18,19,23 10:14,18,21 11:4, 48:4,17,25 51:3, 48:25

7,9,16,21 12:1,4, 9,12,15,16,20,22 13:13 14:22,25 15:1 16:17,21,25 17:5,9,12,16,19, 24 18:3,21 19:1, 18,25 20:12 21:1, 4,8,9 22:9 27:24 28:2,8,11 29:2,16, 18,19,21,23 30:9, 25 31:5,10,12,13, 16 43:11,12,14,19 45:4,6,10,25 46:20,24 47:1,8, 12 48:20,22 49:13,25 50:4,7, 19,24 51:10,15, 19,21,22 52:2,5,7, 9,11,14,17,19,22 53:1,8,20 54:4,7, 9,12,18,20,22,23 55:3 **judges** 21:22

Judges' 21:19

June 9:1,3 10:2 23:7 38:17,18 42:24,25

Κ

kind 25:24 27:7,23

L

label 15:8 18:14

labeled 16:21 19:20 28:3 31:9

labor 32:21 35:15

language 13:23

larger 35:9

late 18:23 19:15 20:7,14 21:16 31:25 32:2

Law 5:8 14:25 21:8

Lead 3:3 5:8,25

6:16

ledger 28:18,20 41:6 57:7

left 13:6

letter 15:18

liability 36:24

liable 35:17,23

light 8:12

limited 18:13

list 9:2

listed 46:17,18 53:13

listing 17:7 19:12 20:10 27:7,16 28:25 30:8 46:15 47:6 48:7 50:6 51:6,17 52:16

listings 17:23

location 32:3

logistical 22:5

long 9:17 16:5 18:9

looked 16:8 24:5 26:17 27:14 57:10

loss 34:17

lot 30:13,19 56:17 57:12

loudly 6:7

low 34:18

lowest 40:9.11

lump 32:14 35:18, 24 36:5,6,7,16 37:24 44:5 53:16

M

made 21:20 32:7 45:11 47:4 50:20 56:23

main 16:23 22:19 26:4 57:2

maintain 36:9 43:23

maintenance 31:24

make 16:11 21:25 25:21 27:22 46:13 57:15

makers 6:1

March 8:22 10:5 23:6 32:18

MARIE 2:19

markup 35:6 38:19

match 17:22 18:15

material 32:15 35:20 36:5,19 37:2 38:3,10,23 43:16 44:4 46:11 53:15,16,18 56:7,

materials 26:25 34:12 35:18 36:14 37:5,12 38:4,9,22 39:23,25 40:7 41:13,15,19,21 44:4

matter 2:5 7:13

maximum 21:15

meaningful 20:14

measure 7:20 29:5 33:24 37:2,5 39:5,8 40:11 50:13 51:3 53:10,

Members 3:4

23 54:16

mentioned 29:24 40:13

merchandise 32:4,5

method 40:10,20 56:3

methods 33:17

mic 8:14,15

Michael 3:4 5:24 6:18

microphone 8:12

microphones 6:7

million 32:20,21 34:25 35:4,8,14 37:13,14,19,21 39:25 41:14,21 45:15 46:7,8,12

minute 52:5 54:25

minutes 7:15,18 10:14 13:17 14:4 21:11,13,24 22:11 31:15

miscategorizatio

n 28:23 29:11

miscategorized 16:22 28:3,5 29:4

misleading 25:25

misunderstood 10:12,19

moment 54:23

Monday 19:22

month 23:17

months 8:7 12:6, 17 43:2 46:6

Moser 3:6 4:13,21

morning 15:5 19:23 20:1

7:8 8:2,5,10,13, 16,18,22 9:13 10:12,17,19 11:3, 5,8 12:2 13:16 15:22,24 16:20,23 17:1,7,10,15,18, 21 18:2,8,23 19:8 20:9 21:3,14 22:7, 10,14 27:25 28:1, 4,9,12 29:6 30:2, 11 31:3,6,11 47:2, 6,10,18 48:21 49:7,24 50:3,5,18, 23 51:5,13,17,20, 25 52:2,4,8,10,13, 15,18,20,24 53:7 54:9,10,17,25 55:2,7

move 8:14,15 14:1 15:1 20:19 54:24

Ν

Nalan 3:10 6:22, 25

names 6:19

necessarily 5:17 54:11

needed 6:7 18:6

negative 35:5

net 34:17,18 35:11

non-conceded

non-taxable

26:13 28:10 32:21 35:15 56:19

note 9:24 10:1

notice 15:20

notification

14:18

notified 15:13,19

number 5:7 6:13 26:18 44:12,13,17 51:7,15,21,24 52:4,11 57:25

numbers 45:23 51:5

0

Oaks 31:21

object 14:19

objection 11:17 14:12,16,18 19:19 20:13 21:2

objections 11:20 20:22

objective 44:21

observe 48:25 49:2

October 9:4 10:3 23:18 42:24 43:1

offer 19:4

office 2:1 5:10 9:12 13:3 15:13, 17 22:21,25 23:12 24:14 29:24 30:4, 6,12,13 57:23

Offices 6:11

official 6:10

opened 31:25 32:3

opening 44:15 45:15,17,18,21

operates 31:20

operating 25:19, 22,23

Operations 7:3

opinion 5:18

opportunity 47:21

opposed 13:6 26:22

order 10:10 12:7 21:12

ordered 36:8

orders 7:15,18 10:14 13:17 14:4 21:11

original 17:1,11 30:2 47:8

originally 27:6 47:18

OTA 2:6 5:7,11, 12,14,17,19 6:13 9:9 13:7 15:4

OTA's 5:18 14:4

over-the-counter 38:16

owe 35:20 36:1 50:15

owed 50:14,20

owes 49:18,22

Р

p.m. 2:17,18 5:2 6:14

pages 14:10 15:4 17:2 33:3 34:14 35:16 36:13,24 37:10,16,20 38:1, 7,20 41:8,16 46:19 51:9 57:2

paid 16:15 19:8,9, 10 23:23 27:2 32:6,8 36:11 37:14,22,23 38:4 43:17 44:1 45:3,7 47:16,20,21,23,24 48:1 50:2,21,25 57:11

panel 3:3,4 5:22 43:10,12

paper 46:12

Park 2:16

Parker 3:10 7:2 12:16,21 51:8,23 53:20 54:6,8

part 5:17 9:24 10:1 16:21 18:17 20:16 28:3,13,24 51:9 55:7

participants 6:19

parties 5:19 14:2 15:18,19 21:20

partly 55:12,13

party 5:23 21:9

patience 19:2

pay 35:19,25 49:15,16

paying 45:1

payment 36:15 37:15 47:4 49:2, 17,23

pays 49:20

penalty 12:12,14 13:15,23 43:4

people 18:12 28:13 30:23

perceive 26:22

percent 34:4,8 35:6 38:19 39:15, 18 41:2 42:7,13 56:18

percentage 34:3, 7 39:14,17 45:17, 19,20

percentages 45:20

perfect 25:1 26:1 48:14

performed 33:7 36:9,22 37:2,3 38:15 40:17 42:18

period 9:5,24 10:1 13:4 32:5,17,19 33:5,10,24 34:10, 14,24 36:10,20 37:8,24 38:12,17 39:1,6,10,15,20 44:9 55:20,23

periods 8:1,6,9, 19,22,25 9:2,6,14, 23,25 10:6 13:1 42:22

perjury 12:13,14 13:15,23 43:4

person 24:4 30:22 49:12

personal 47:3,16 49:1 50:16,21

place 25:9

Index: Plaza..recommend

Plaza 2:16 **prior** 9:6 14:6 purchased 26:25 quick 25:12,13 15:25 32:5 36:15 49:10 27:25 53:21 point 23:5 32:16 50:2,16 51:2 50:11,24 51:3 problem 16:9 R 55:18.21 18:9 28:13 30:20 purchases 24:18 26:16 32:6,7,8 points 54:1 problems 16:4 33:4,19,21 34:6,9, raise 22:4 pool 32:3 49:19, procedure 37:1 13 35:3,8,25 rate 42:6,13 20,23 36:10,11,19 proceed 22:9 37:12,14,15,22,23 re-did 31:8 **pools** 2:6 5:6 6:12 **PROCEEDINGS** 38:24 39:3,23,24 24:12,13,16 31:23 read 16:2 40:1,2,6,15,18,19 2:15 32:11 41:13,15,19,20, readily 18:11 process 6:2,8 22,23 44:1,2,7,10, **portion** 16:18 42:20 reading 17:4 49:24 12,15,22,23 45:3, 7,16,18 46:1,5,6, processing 42:8, ready 22:10 54:25 portions 11:24 7,11,18 47:3,7 12:3,24 13:4 real 53:21 48:18 50:12,25 produce 6:9 51:1,8 53:6,13 **POS** 33:9 realize 10:12 54:3,5,14,15 57:7 produced 40:24 **POSA's** 33:8 rearranging purchasing products 24:16 15:25 position 27:23 24:21 49:8,9 45:1 profit 38:6,25 39:4 reason 9:15 18:23 **purely** 26:20 44:18 49:21,24 22:20 possession 13:6 50:20 51:2 53:6 purpose 12:18 56:2 reasonable 40:8, 29:12 53:14 **proof** 19:5 25 42:3 43:6 45:3 practically 17:17 purposes 5:25 proper 25:9 reasonableness prehearing 7:13, 25:10,14 33:17 14,16,17,25 8:3 properly 49:8 put 10:9,13 15:25 10:9,23 13:17 56:16 reasons 43:8 14:3,4,11,15 16:1,13 18:4,13 **property** 47:3,17 rebuttal 21:23,25 25:18,19,22,23 15:12 18:5 20:21 49:1 50:16,21 28:22 52:15 57:15 48:11 54:25 55:3 21:5,11,24 42:4 proposed 15:7,8 recall 7:25 8:3 prepare 56:15 42:13 Q 10:9 present 6:3 prove 20:8 receipt 15:17 33:9 presentation quarters 35:10,13 34:21 **provide** 33:6,11 4:10 12:18 21:13, 35:12 40:13,16 question 7:24 8:8 receipts 33:9 18 22:10,13 29:20 48:12 55:15,17,22 9:8,23 10:7 11:14, 34:1 31:14,18 43:9 17 15:10 17:19 provided 41:5,6,9 receive 10:14 presentations 19:3 23:2,9,21 43:5 46:14 48:12, 14:17 15:5 21:20 22:4 27:25 29:23 47:19 16,17 53:24 54:1 48:24 57:14 received 4:5,6 presented 5:16, 55:9 14:14.24 15:2.4 21 questions 6:2 purchase 22:22 19:22.25 20:4 15:9 20:2,5 21:19, pretty 20:3 25:7,8 24:21 30:5 33:6 21:7 23:18 22 22:5 23:10,14 34:7,12 35:19 previously 5:16 29:17,19,22 receives 49:23 36:12 37:7,8,11, 17:12 41:6 30:15,17 31:12 19 41:3,9,12 49:1 recently 15:2 43:10,11,13 47:1 price 50:14 51:2 50:14,21 53:24 53:8 54:18,21,22 recommend 12:6 54:6 57:21 **prices** 38:16

recommendation 22 43:3 respect 45:11 S 43:5 50:1 remind 5:11 recommends respond 11:22 reminded 14:2 **sale** 32:16,22,25 12:23 15:10 42:21 33:10 34:23 35:3, reminder 5:22 record 5:6,17 6:5, Respondent 3:8 9,14 38:9,11,21 12,20 55:14 56:4 removal 22:15 39:9,18 53:12,13, response 11:11, 19 54:6 recorded 32:16 17 20:7,14 48:23 repair 31:24 **sales** 32:6,7,9,15, records 33:6 result 33:11 report 23:8 33:3 16,20 33:6,7,9,12, 34:12 55:8,9,11, 34:9 38:17 40:17 resulted 38:18 13,18,21 34:1,3,6, 14,19,21 56:1,23 56:18 7 35:11,13,15,19, 57:5.19.20 resulting 32:22, reported 2:19 25 36:15,19 38:2, 24 recovered 43:21 32:19,22,24 4,5,6,8,12,16,17, 33:10,12,18,25 results 40:25 23,24 39:14 40:25 reduced 37:21 34:22,23 35:2,5,9, 43:15,17,24 44:1, retail 24:15,19 refer 13:16 20:15 11,12,13 36:18 3,6,16 45:3,7 31:25 32:3,15 37:4 39:9,18 50:1,20 53:15,18, referring 46:20, 36:5,6 38:2,4,6,9, 44:16 56:20 24 55:18,19,21 22 50:8 11,12,21,24 56:10,11,18,19,20 reporter 2:20 43:15,16,24 44:1, reflected 34:2 6:24 32:1,13,23 3 45:2,7 49:9,10 Samarawickrem 35:4 33:1.15 39:14 50:1 52:1,10 53:4, a 3:10 4:14 6:22,25 44:13 reformatting 15,18 11:14,20,25 12:5, 16:13 17:3 11,14 13:12 14:21 reporting 6:4 retention 55:14 20:25 22:8 31:16, refused 55:8 reports 56:11 **return** 25:15,17 19 32:2,14,24 29:25 30:15 34:17 regard 36:3 33:2,16 43:18,20 representative 36:20 56:21 44:14 45:5,9,13 regulation 18:7 7:6 53:22 46:3,22,25 53:9, returned 30:9,11, representatives regulations 14:5 14 31:1 20:18 6:20 sampling 55:17 **returns** 33:13 reimbursement request 10:8,13, 34:3,22 35:5 **Sanchez** 2:19 6:3 36:11,15 42:21 22 11:1,18,22 56:16 12:6,8 13:14,21 sat 22:24 57:22 rejected 42:11,15 22:16 41:3 42:16 reversed 26:4 schedule 20:11 rejects 42:1 43:3,8 review 12:5 14:13 22:3 46:10,18 requested 40:14 41:2 42:21 relate 17:7,10 47:9,15 50:12,25 51:8.10.11 53:3.5. reviewed 34:16 require 14:5 related 10:7 16:3 14 54:3 46:15 19:17 20:9 31:23 32:4, 11 33:8 schedules 54:14 required 19:10 **rights** 49:15 relates 26:11,12 seeking 8:1,8,19 resale 32:9 room 30:13 relating 38:3 Seemingly 35:23 resell 27:1 route 26:7,12 56:9 relied 33:14 sell 24:15 32:3 reserve 29:19 rules 20:18 relief 7:21,24 8:1, selling 38:16 resolved 23:21, running 24:9,10 2,7,9,20 9:10,25 49:12 24,25 25:1 10:8,21,22 11:1, sells 49:20 resource 13:24 13,18,22 12:25 13:14,21 42:7,16, send 11:8 56:24

sense 27:22 **sooner** 17:20 stop 6:8 9:20 supposed 19:11 24:23 41:5 56:18 sounds 52:22 sentence 33:15 **store** 24:13,15 **Suzanne** 3:3 5:7 31:25 32:3,16 separate 5:14 **source** 35:12 36:5,7 37:5 38:11, 6:16 50:10 September 9:9 24 43:16 49:10 swimming 31:23 **sources** 33:13 15:16 17:25 23:18 straightened 32:11 42:25 56:22 spa 32:4 **switch** 31:13 **service** 26:7,12 streamline 21:17 **space** 18:13 switched 27:7 52:1,10 53:4 stretches 9:17 **spas** 31:23 32:11 services 27:3 **system** 15:5 31:25 46:2,14 stuff 18:16 26:17 32:16 33:9 speak 6:6 27:3 31:7 56:25 servicing 24:12 speaks 6:5 57:8 Т set 24:17 25:7 **specific** 42:10,19 sub-contracts 50:11 settlement 42:19 46:13 talk 7:11,23 14:7 specifically 22:14 56:10 subject 33:4,19, **sheet** 16:25 33:13 46:13 21,24 34:10 talked 7:16 10:16, shelf 38:15,18 36:17,19 40:1,2, **spent** 42:19 23 48:8 56:7,10 Sherman 31:21 15,18,19 41:22,23 spreadsheet talking 11:16 53:6,25 54:1 Shorthand 2:20 15:3 16:17,24 50:8,9 56:9 57:1 submission 14:5 17:1 **show** 19:8.11 tangible 47:3,16 **submit** 10:10,25 55:8,19 56:11 spreadsheet als 49:1 50:16,21 11:1 13:14 15:18 **o** 17:11 showed 49:2 tax 2:1 3:8 5:11, submitted 5:19 spreadsheets 13,15 6:11 7:4 **showing** 19:13 14:9 15:3,11,14, 14:10,19 16:19 13:3 16:15 19:8,9, 21 16:19 17:13,20 50:9,10 12,13,15,16,17 18:1 19:6,21 **shown** 18:16 23:22 24:6,8,22, **staff** 41:12 47:13 48:5 50:7 23 25:15,16 27:2, **shows** 20:11 staffed 5:12 3 29:4,8 32:6,8,15 submitting 40:24 47:14,24 33:4,13,19,21,24 11:10,18 48:5 51:3 52:15 stamp 51:24 52:4 34:2,10,17,22 suggesting signed 10:22 12:6 start 6:18,20 35:5,19,20,23,25 49:17 43:4 27:25 36:11,12,15,17, 19,20,23 37:5,14, **Suite** 2:16 similar 45:10 started 23:6 15,22,23 38:4,5, 53:17 sum 32:14 35:18, state 2:2,21 3:8 10.23 40:1.3.16. 24 36:5,6,7,16 simple 49:7 18,19,21,23 6:19 32:7 47:16 37:24 44:5 53:16 41:22,23 43:17 single 56:2 **state's** 5:13 44:1 45:3,7,21 summarized 46:5 47:4,20,23 sir 53:9 **stated** 36:18 7:15 48:1,6,19 49:2,8, 41:18 42:10 **sitting** 48:11 summary 19:5 9,11,15,16,17,18, statement 4:18 20,22 50:2,14,15, **sold** 25:8,19,22,23 supervisor 24:4 55:6 57:16 20,21,25 53:6,11, 28:5,6,17,20,21, supplies 32:4 25 54:2,14 56:11, 24 29:1,10 57:6 **states** 15:21 36:14 20 57:10 **solely** 53:23 Stenographer **support** 33:10,12 taxable 7:20 26:8. 6:3,7,9 somebody's 43:6 16,24 28:10 29:4, 26:15

15 32:22,23,24 33:18,21,23 34:1, 3,5,6 37:2 39:5,8, 9,10,13,14,18,19 40:2 44:7 45:24 50:13 51:3 52:21, 23,24,25 54:16 56:20

taxed 48:6

taxes 27:13 35:17 36:1

taxpayer 44:25 45:8

telling 57:22

ten 9:16 35:10 46:16 56:6

terms 20:4 57:6

test 7:21 25:3,24 26:6,7,14,20 27:9, 21 28:17 29:9 33:23 36:23 37:1, 3 38:15,18 40:8, 21 42:6,11 44:25 45:14 46:11 53:17 55:22,25 57:3,5

testing 56:4

thing 17:22 18:10, 17 22:14 27:21 29:14 45:19 48:9

things 18:13 21:17 22:5 25:16 26:4 27:19 48:15 57:17

thought 10:19,24

thoughts 12:4

three-year 55:20

time 6:2,5 8:1 9:13,17,23,24,25 10:25 13:5 14:11, 13 15:13 18:6,11, 19 21:14,18,23 22:1 23:1,2 24:10 29:22 30:24 32:15 38:3,10,22 42:19 43:16 56:7,8,13, 21 **timeliness** 19:24 20:13

timely 14:9 15:11

times 9:19,20 35:9

timing 55:13

today 5:21,24 6:13,17 7:11,12 20:5 22:6 46:21 48:5

total 32:20 33:18 34:23 35:2,8,9,11, 13 37:19 38:11,21 39:24 41:13,20 43:2 44:6 46:10,

totaled 8:7

TPP 50:20 53:5

trained 25:13

transaction 41:10

transcript 2:15 6:10

true 26:9 55:9

trust 27:11

turn 19:18 29:16

U

Uh-huh 28:1

ultimate 49:12

Ultimately 33:22 40:10

unable 33:20 40:18 43:25

understand

11:14 12:9,15 18:8 32:1 49:13 54:9,10 56:1,5,16, 17 57:9,24

understanding

9:13,15 45:25 55:13 understands 25:6

understood 56:6

unreasonable 42:8,17

unreported 7:20 33:23 36:23 39:10,13,19 40:1, 2,15,19,21,23 41:22,23 44:7 45:24

unusual 30:18 **uphold** 20:12

V

vastly 26:17

vendor 24:21 36:11 47:4

vendors 24:18 32:6,7,8 36:16 37:14,23 41:10 46:17

verbatim 6:4

verification 33:17

verify 33:20 42:12 46:4

versus 46:12

W

wanted 11:23 12:22 22:14 28:2

warranted 7:19, 22 9:25

ways 32:5

website 6:11 13:19,20

Wednesday 2:18 5:1 6:13 11:6

week 11:2,6 32:6

weeks 11:2 13:18 22:25 30:8 57:23

whichever 24:23

wholesale 24:20

witnesses 21:10

Wong 3:5 5:24 6:18 29:21,23 30:9,25 31:5,10, 12 54:20,22

work 28:15 41:7, 12

works 15:5

world 48:14

writing 11:23 12:10,12 13:15

written 5:18 11:22 22:16

wrong 20:11 29:8, 10 50:12 51:4 57:17

X

X-TAX 20:10 34:12 39:3,22 40:6,15 41:14,19 44:2,10,11,14,22 45:21,22 47:7 48:7 51:1,6,8 52:15,16,20 54:3,

Υ

year 34:18,19 53:14

years 9:16 18:4 25:14 34:1,17,22 48:9 53:18 56:6

yesterday 15:6, 23 19:23 41:9 46:15

yield 40:10