BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ΙN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF,)			
С.	GOLI	DFARB,))	OTA	NO.	21098546
				A.	PPELLAN'	г.)			
)			

TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Friday, January 27, 2023

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS						
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA						
3							
4							
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,)						
6	C. GOLDFARB, OF THE APPEAL OF,) OTA NO. 21098546						
7	APPELLANT.)						
8	AFFELLANI.)						
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14	Transcript of Electronic Proceedings,						
15	taken in the State of California, commencing						
16	at 2:00 p.m. and concluding at 2:12 p.m. on						
17	Friday, January 27, 2023, reported by						
18	Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter, in and						
19	for the State of California.						
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Panel Lead:	ALJ SARA HOSEY
4	Panel Members:	ALJ SUZANNE BROWN
5	raner members.	ALJ OVSEP AKOPCHIKYAN
6	For the Appellant:	C. GOLDFARB
7	Harry than Danner dants	
8	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD
9		CAMILLE DIXON CHRISTOPHER TUTTLE
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1		I N D E X					
2							
3		EXHIBITS					
4							
5	(Appellant's Exhibits conference.)	1-2 were received at the prehearing					
6 7	(Appellant's Exhibits 3-8 were received at page 6.)						
8	(Department's Exhibits A-G were received at the prehearing conference.)						
9	(Department's Exhibit H was received at page 7.)						
10							
11		PRESENTATION					
12							
13		<u>PAGE</u>					
14	By Ms. Goldfarb	7					
15	By Ms. Dixon	11					
16							
17							
18		CLOSING STATEMENT					
19		PAGE					
20	By Ms. Goldfarb	13					
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

California;	Friday,	January	27,	2023
	2:00 p	. m .		

2.4

JUDGE HOSEY: We are now on the record. This is the Appeal of C. Goldfarb, Case Number 21098546. Today is January 27, 2023, and it's approximately 2:00 p.m. This hearing is being held virtually via Webex with the consent of the parties.

I am lead Administrative Law Judge Sara Hosey, and with me today are Judge Suzanne Brown and Judge Ovsep Akopchikyan. I want to remind today's participants that the Office of Tax Appeals is an independent appeals body staffed by tax experts and is independent of the State tax agencies.

Our decision will be based on the arguments and evidence provided by the parties on this appeal in conjunction with the appropriate application of the law. We have read the briefs and examined the submitted exhibits and are looking forward to the presentations today.

Can I have the parties please state your names for the record, starting with Ms. Goldfarb, please.

MS. GOLDFARB: Carina Goldfarb.

JUDGE HOSEY: And for the Franchise Tax Board.

MS. DIXON: Camille Dixon, Tax Counsel.

1 Topher Tuttle for the Franchise Tax MR. TUTTLE: 2 Board. 3 JUDGE HOSEY: The issue on appeal today is whether the claim for refund for the 2016 tax year is 4 5 barred by the statute of limitations and the amounts are 6 also in dispute. 7 As for the exhibits, we have marked Exhibits 1 and 2 for Appellant and A through G for Respondent at the 8 9 prehearing conference held on November 30th, 2022. 10 objections were raised by either party, and Exhibits 1 and 11 2 and A through G were admitted into the record. We have 12 also marked Exhibits 3 through 8 for Appellant and Exhibit H for Respondent. 13 14 Ms. Goldfarb, were there any objections to those 15 exhibits? 16 MS. GOLDFARB: No. 17 JUDGE HOSEY: Ms. Dixon, were there any 18 objections to those exhibits? 19 MS. DIXON: No. 20 JUDGE HOSEY: Hearing no objections, Exhibits 3 2.1 through 8 and Exhibit H are now admitted as evidence into 22 the record. 23 (Appellant's Exhibits 3-8 were received 2.4 in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) /// 25

(Department's Exhibits H is received in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)

All right. Ms. Goldfarb, we're going to swear you in. Can you please raise your right hand.

C. GOLDFARB,

produced as a witness, and having been first duly sworn by the Administrative Law Judge, was examined and testified as follows:

JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. You have 15 minutes for your testimony and arguments. Please begin.

2.1

2.4

PRESENTATION

MS. GOLDFARB: So I agree that I was late filing taxes for 2016, and I agree that I should have a penalty for being late. At that time I started receiving all these notices. I was pretty overwhelmed with the language, and it's something I'm not used to. At some point I requested my accountant -- my former accountant, Steve Temple, to help me with these notices to take care of it. He answered back that he was busy taking care of other customers and couldn't take care of it for me.

So until I got actually another accountant firm to help me out, it was too late. It was past the statute

of limitation time and the money was already pulled out of my account. So this new accountant helped me appeal, and that's why we're here. But initially, the problem was that my former accountant didn't help me, and I didn't know how to manage.

2.4

There were difficult times for my business. I had to let go of my bookkeeper. I had to take care of everything on my own for my business and my priority was to keep going and keep the business running and having new collections and everything else but the taxes. And my major mistake was assuming that knowingly that eventually I would take care of the taxes. I thought even if I don't do it timely I will be able to recover the money that was levied from the account, and that's my mistake because I was ignorant. I didn't know any better.

I just assumed, wrongly, that that's the way it would be, and now I'm hurting. I have less money in my account because the money was levied, and I didn't understand how this account -- how this amount came out to be. Somebody explained to me the other day in the prehearing conference, and I understand the several forms of coming up to this amount. But I think that's unfair that nobody looked exactly into my situation and my -- my tax returns from previous years that shows that I didn't -- I wasn't paying that much money for taxes.

So I know I owe money for the penalties, but I took care of the 2016 taxes eventually and didn't have the type of income to have — to pay this much money that was calculated. And that's my main request that it will calculate this amount based on the reality of my business and not compared to other types of businesses that I'm not even sure what type of businesses those are that were compared to mine. It looks to me like they were not applying all the expenses that it takes to manage this business.

2.1

2.4

So I request an explanation of what type of business this -- my business was compared to -- to come up with this amount that I feel is unfair. This is what I'm requesting. Not -- I'm not saying that the statute of limitation time didn't pass. I'm not saying that I shouldn't be paying a penalty. I'm saying that I feel it's not the actual reality of my business, the amount that was charged at the time. And that's what I'm requesting to be reviewed basically, is -- it's just that.

I think I was pretty clear. I mean, my fault for being ignorant about the way things are with the IRS and the taxes of how things are. It's the first time I go through this. And also the lack of knowledge legal terminology, that didn't help me to take care of this timely. So that's basically --

1 So I did submit this Excel sheet proving that, 2 and there's all the documentation attached that the 3 previous years the adjusted gross income were under \$10,000 from 2012 to 2016, 2016 included. I'm not what 4 5 was calculated by the Franchise Board of Equalization 6 [sic], and I conclude my explanation. 7 JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you, Ms. Goldfarb. Let me see if the Franchise Tax Board has any 8 9 questions. 10 MS. DIXON: No questions. 11 JUDGE HOSEY: Then let me check with my Panel 12 members as well. 13 Judge Brown, do you have any questions? 14 JUDGE BROWN: I do not. No. 15 JUDGE HOSEY: Judge Akopchikyan, do you have any 16 questions? 17 JUDGE AKOPCHIKYAN: No questions here. Thank 18 you. 19 MS. GOLDFARB: We can't hear you. 20 JUDGE HOSEY: Can you hear me? 21 THE STENOGRAPHER: We can hear you now, but I 22 think there are issues when you come back on that we're 23 not able to hear you. 2.4 JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. I will just yell into the 25 microphone here. Let's go ahead. Thank you,

1 Ms. Goldfarb. We will have five minutes for another
2 statement after the Franchise Tax Board has their
3 presentation.

So, Ms. Dixon, are you ready to begin your presentation?

MS. DIXON: Yes.

JUDGE HOSEY: Please, again when ready. Thank you.

2.4

PRESENTATION

MS. DIXON: Good afternoon. My name is Camille Dixon. I am tax counsel with the Franchise Tax Board and will be representing the Franchise Tax Board. Along with me is my co-counsel Topher Tuttle, Tax Counsel III with the Franchise Tax Board.

The evidence shows that the Appellant has failed to establish that a timely claim for refund was filed for the 2016 tax year before the statute of limitations expired. Under the applicable section of the Revenue & Taxation Code, the general statute of limitations provides that the last day to file a claim for refund is the later of four years from the date the return was filed, if filed within the extended due date, which does not apply here, four years from the due date of the return without regard to extensions, or one year from the date of over payment.

For the 2016 tax year, both the four-year and one-year statute of limitations expired before Appellant filed her return. She late filed her return on August 4th, 2011, well after the four-year statute of limitations. And the last payment FTB received was on April 19th, 2019. Therefore, the one-year statute of limitations is also unavailable to allow a refund for the Appellant for the 2016 tax year.

2.4

Appellant contends she gave the tax information to her accountant, the accountant late-filed the return, and she should still be eligible for the refund. And while FTB is absolutely sympathetic to Appellant's unfortunate situation, such hardships do not change her responsibility to timely file a return and will not extend the statute of limitations. Further, there is no reasonable cause or equitable basis for suspending the statute of limitations.

The Office of Tax Appeals in its precedential opinion in Appeal of Benemi Partners found that the language of the statute of limitations is explicit and must be strictly construed. And the United States Supreme Court in United States versus Dom explain that this is true even when it is later shown that the tax is not owed in the first place.

Unfortunately, FTB is prevented by law from

1 granting Appellant's claim for refund. FTB, therefore, 2 respectfully request that the Office of Tax Appeals 3 sustain the Franchise Tax Board's claim for refund denial for the 2016 tax year. 4 Thank you, and I'm happy to answer any questions. 5 JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you, Ms. Dixon. 6 7 Let me check with my Panel to see if there are any questions. Judge Brown? 8 9 JUDGE BROWN: No questions at this time. Thank 10 you. 11 JUDGE HOSEY: Judge Akopchikyan? 12 JUDGE AKOPCHIKYAN: No questions here. Thank 13 you. 14 JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you. 15 I have no questions right now either. 16 Ms. Goldfarb, you do have 5 minutes for any final 17 statements you would like to make before we close the 18 record for the case. Do you have any other comments you 19 would like to make? 20 21 CLOSING STATEMENT 22 MS. GOLDFARB: No, just the matter of timing. 23 mean the -- I have requested help from the accountant. 2.4 was March 2019. Then the statute of limitations end up by

April 15, 2021, and I did file. You know, it was 2021

25

which was a few months after the statute of limitation had 1 2 ended. And it's a shame for a few months that I didn't 3 get my act together and taking care of -- you know, finding a new person who did take care of my taxes and 4 5 help me through this that I had been punished that way 6 because I really -- that money makes a big difference. 7 I'm struggling with the business, and most likely the business is not going to stay open. So I just ask for 8 9 consideration. 10 That's all. 11 JUDGE HOSEY: Ms. Goldfarb, we really appreciate 12 you being here today. I'm going to check with my Panel. 13 Can you hear me? 14 MS. GOLDFARB: Now we can. 15 JUDGE HOSEY: I'm sorry. Thank you for coming 16 today. We really appreciate your time in this manner. 17 I'm going to check with my Panel one last time 18 just to make sure we don't have any further questions. 19 Judge Brown, do you have any questions? 20 JUDGE BROWN: No, I do not. Thank you. 21 Judge Akopchikyan? JUDGE HOSEY: 22 JUDGE AKOPCHIKYAN: I have no questions either. 23 Thank you. 2.4 JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Thank you. 25 So evidence has been submitted into the record,

and we have the arguments and your briefs, as well as the oral argument and testimony presented today. We now have a complete record from which to base our decision, and we're ready to submit the case. The record is now closed. This concludes the hearing for this appeal. The party should expect our written opinion no later than 100 days from today. With that, we're now off the record, and the hearing is adjourned. Thank you everyone. (Proceedings adjourned at 2:12 p.m.) 2.4

1 HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter in and for 3 the State of California, do hereby certify: 4 5 That the foregoing transcript of proceedings was 6 taken before me at the time and place set forth, that the 7 testimony and proceedings were reported stenographically 8 by me and later transcribed by computer-aided 9 transcription under my direction and supervision, that the 10 foregoing is a true record of the testimony and 11 proceedings taken at that time. 12 I further certify that I am in no way interested 13 in the outcome of said action. 14 I have hereunto subscribed my name this 2nd day 15 of March, 2023. 16 17 18 19 ERNALYN M. ALONZO 20 HEARING REPORTER 21 2.2 23 2.4 25