## BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Appeal of:	)Case No. )21067910
FOROUZAN GOLSHANI,	)
	)
Appellant.	)
	)

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Cerritos, California

Tuesday, February 14, 2023

Reported by:

SKYY CHUNG Hearing Reporter

Job No.: 40663 OTA(A-PM)(REV3)

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	In the Matter of the Appeal of: )Case No.
6	)21067910 FOROUZAN GOLSHANI,
7	Appellant. )
8	)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
16	Cerritos, California, commencing at 1:05 p.m.
17	on Tuesday, February 14, 2023, reported by
18	Skyy Chung, Hearing Reporter.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	Panel Lead:	ASAF KLETTER, JUDGE MIKE LE, JUDGE
3		EDDY LAM, JUDGE
4		
5	For the Department:	DAVID HUNTER PARVIZ IRANPOUR
6		Franchise Tax Board PO Box 942840
7		Sacramento, CA 94240 (800) 852-5711
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21 22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX
2	
3	EXHIBITS
4	
5	(DEPARTMENT'S EXHIBITS A-S WERE ADMITTED ON PAGE 6)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	PRESENTATION
11	PAGE
12	MR. GOLSHANI 6
13	MR. IRANPOUR 19
14	
15	
16	CLOSING ARGUMENT
17	PAGE
18	MR. GOLSHANI 25
19	MR. IRANPOUR 27
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERRITOS, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2023 1:05 P.M.

2.4

JUDGE KLETTER: We are now going on the record.

Let's go on the record. This is the appeal of Golshani,

Case No. 21067910. Today is Tuesday, February 14th,

2023, and the time is approximately 1:05 p.m. We are

holding this hearing today in Cerritos, California. My

name is Judge Kletter, and I will be the lead

administrative law judge for this appeal. With me are

administrative law judges, Mike Le and Eddy Lam.

Can the parties please each identify yourself.

Just for the record, please state your name, beginning with the Appellant.

MR. GOLSHANI: My name is Forouzan Golshani.

MS. GOLSHANI: My name is Rezvanieh Golshani.

MR. IRANPOUR: Good afternoon, Judges. My name is Parviz Iranpour. With me, David Hunter, and we will be representing the Franchise Tax Board.

JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank you. So the issue today is whether Appellant has shown error in FTB's proposed assessment of additional taxes for the 2015, 2016, and 2017 tax years. With respect to the evidentiary record, FTB has provided Exhibits A through S. Appellant did not object to the misspelling of these

exhibits; therefore, these exhibits are entered into the record.

(EXHIBITS A THROUGH S WERE ADMITTED INTO THE RECORD.)

JUDGE KLETTER: Appellant has not provided any exhibits, and no additional exhibits were presented today.

Mr. Golshani, you will have 20 minutes for your presentation. So please begin when you're ready. Thank you.

MR. GOLSHANI: Thank you.

2.4

2.

## PRESENTATION

MR. GOLSHANI: This is Forouzan Golshani. Esteemed panel of judges, Counsels representing the FTB, and others present here for these proceedings, thank you for your time and effort. I present this brief statement on behalf of the Appellant, Forouzan Golshani. That would be me. And my wife -- and his wife -- this is Rezvanieh Golshani, who is accompanying me for this evening.

As a preface, I would like to extend my sincere thanks for the service that you are providing to the public. Like you, I'm proud of my participation and civic duties as a commissioner on the Los Angeles County Aviation Commission. I hope, unlike me, who is being

paid \$25 per month for the salary service, you're compensated for the true value of your important service. At the time of prehearing meeting, dated January 19, 2023, the Appellant was not certain that there might be any additional documents that should be presented to the court. After further review, I'm pleased to to inform you that beyond what was presented already, there will be no additional documents. As such, hopefully, these proceedings should be considerably shorter, specifically because I intend to keep this statement to a minimum.

In this presentation, I intend to impart one simple message, which is, the case before you is about basic human rights. Yes. FTB lawyers have been keen to pigeonhole the Appellant into this narrowly defined minutia of tax codes, without any consideration for what is universally considered to be a basic human right, and then point out all of the laws that are shattered because of deviations from the minutia code that they have found to be applicable.

This presentation will attempt to show that the line of reasoning pursued by FTB violate the United States Bill of Rights, and more specifically, all of the subsequent laws that safeguard the right to decent housing. Here's the background for the statement:

Following President Franklin Roosevelt's declaration in 1944 State of Union address, that every citizen has the right to a decent home. In 1948, the United States signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UDHR, recognizing adequate housing as a component of the human right to an adequate standard of living. Furthermore, the right to adequate housing was codified into a binding treaty law by the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, ICESCR, in 1966.

As we all know, at the present time, our State of California is at the forefront of making provisions, so that this important social justice principal can be implemented more fairly, universally, and without any prejudice. Another point that I would like to emphasize is that the Appellant never had a choice to be in this position. And we're forced -- I'm sorry. Let's start again -- never had the choice to be in this position, and we're forced into a situation that was entirely beyond their control. It is important to note that an honest taxpayer -- as honest taxpayers, they tried at all times to adhere to all applicable laws, and all codes of ethics; therefore, this case is not a "got you" case.

Until the time of this audit, their tax returns were prepared by H and R Block, for which, they face

their friend's ridicule, that, quote, "You might be better off financially if IRS itself did your taxes," in reference to the facts that H and R block is highly conservative in preparing their client's tax returns.

Allow me to begin by introducing the Appellants: Mrs. Golshani is, and has always been a homemaker since she and her husband immigrated to the U.S. in 1984. Dr. Golshani has been a civil servant engaged in university education as an academic professional. He started as an assistant professor in 1984 and ascended through the ranks of associate and full professor, and subsequently, as a department chair and college dean.

During the entire time as a state employee, his taxes were deducted automatically from his monthly paychecks. In fact, it is important to point out that with the exception of one or three years, during nearly four decades, the Appellants actually overpaid their federal and state withholdings, and of course, had to be repaid the overage of tax repayments after filing.

Also, it is important to point out that, prior to 2009, Mr. and Mrs. Golshani, were never involved in renting out any property, and indeed, never contemplated any such business activity. Simply stated, other than minor consulting income, which were reported on 1099 forms, the entire family income was reported on W-2

forms and was taxed before a penny was paid to Mr. and Mrs. Golshani.

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

And now, onto the case at hand. The panel of esteemed judges have already received the FTB's interpretation of what has transpired. I will now present to you the same facts, however, from the Appellant's point of view. As correctly reported in the FTB filing, Appellants acquired the house in Paradise Valley, Arizona, in 1995. The set property was their primary residence until 2017, as they didn't have any other residential property. In 2004, the Appellant decided to demolish the 50-plus-year-old house and rebuild another that would be more suited to the needs of their expanding family. The rebuilding process, which had been estimated to be \$1 million, but ended up being over \$1.4 million, lasted until 2008; however, in 2007, Dr. Golshani was offered the position of college dean at California State University Long Beach, and he accepted the position. The family decided to sell the house and buy a new family home in California. This would have been plausible and seemingly profitable once the rebuilding process of the Paradise Valley house was completed in 2008. The new house at that time was valued at 3.5 million dollars and was placed on the market for sale.

Unfortunately, by then, the bottom had fallen off the Arizona housing market, and the property values were spiraling down at an astounding pace. Within a period of six months, the recession had caused a total collapse of the Arizona housing market, and there was virtually no sale activities for houses priced at over \$1 million. Desperate to make ends meet and not by any prior design, Golshanis were forced to put the house up for rent. And after nearly one year, a tenant was found. FTB uses such terms as "passive investor" or "landlord" to refer to the Appellant, whereas this was never an investment, and they were simply distressed, frantic, and desperate landlords. Nothing more, and never ever active or passive investors.

Ironically, during the entire time, when there existed a tenant for that house, the mortgage was higher than the rent by a margin of 30 percent at the beginning and around 10 percent in the final years. As such, it is not surprising that the Appellants -- the Appellant is flabbergasted to have been assessed capital gains tax, when in reality, they were perpetually short by as much as \$3500 per month or \$42,000 per year. Where did these losses go? They were poorer, because of the so-called investment, and yet, they are being forced to pay even more tax. The Appellant repeatedly made

efforts to sell the house at a price that was close to what they had paid for it. Their estimate for the target price was \$1.75 million, which would cover the initial payment of around thirty-three hundred thousand dollars, plus the additional cost of rebuilding estimated at 1.4 million. It took nearly ten agonizing years for the market to bounce back to a level that made such a setting price possible.

Eventually, the house was sold in December of 2017 for \$1.72 million, which, after the deduction of nearly \$110,000 for commission and closing costs, resulted in a sheer loss of nearly \$150,000. Yet, there is another relevant point here: Although the Appellant had presented clear accounting of how 1.4 million-dollar loan and the additional out-of-pocket investments were used in building the new house, FTB, at their own will, decided to disallow the significant portion of the submitted expenses, even though anyone who has built or rebuilt a house knows that there are numerous unexpected and inevitable expenses, mostly for permanent fixtures that the builder does not provide.

So let's sum up what happened between 2008 and and 2017. The Appellants paid an annual amount in the range of approximately \$12,000 in the latter years and \$42,000 in earlier years to subsidize the rental and

sold the property at the loss of approximately \$150,000 thousand dollars. And yet, Appellants are being assessed capital gains tax. Where is the logic? is common sense? Where is justice? They are the victims of the recession of 2008. But unlike so many others who were bailed out by the government, which ironically funds the bailouts by means of tax dollars collected from taxpayers, such as the Appellant, they, as the Appellants, are being penalized. "Why?" might ask. Because the civil servant on solely W-2 income -- because as a civil servant on solely W-2 income, none of the loopholes were available to them. I'm referring to the loopholes that are used by those who claim to make billions of dollars every year, but paid \$750 of tax.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As completely inexperienced homeowners who were forced at put up their home for rent, the Appellants were unaware of the like-kind exchange and its formal requirements. Their tax preparers H and R Block, never forewarned them of this necessity. Just as the transaction went through, the Appellants were informed of the requirements by one of the real estate agents. As honest taxpayers, who did not wish to be outside the legal requirements, they attempted and successfully executed all of the requirements for like-kind exchange,

except the use of an intermediary, which couldn't be implemented when they purchased their home in California. As a corollary, they put the California house up for rent, albeit unsuccessfully, for six months before moving into the house. FTB points out that this is not acceptable, even though the spirit of law was fully implemented. The Appellants accept this rigorous application of law since they understand that ignorance of law is not an adequate justification; however, they regret the rigidity that is imposed upon them, because the only difference is the lack of an intermediary and paperwork and nothing else.

JUDGE KLETTER: Mr. Golshani, sorry to interrupt. Wanted to let you know that there are five minutes left remaining in your presentation.

MR. GOLSHANI: Thank you. I only have -- I will wrap it up. There is another shocking point here, one that would outrage any U.S. taxpayer: Between 2020 and 2022, Dr. Golshani made multiple attempts to negotiate a settlement with FTB. At least three unsuccessful phone calls were made to Mr. Cero D. Modeno (phonetic), who is the FTB agent identified by FTB attorney, Mr. John Yousef (phonetic), as the contact person; however, even after multiple attempts, when Dr. Golshani succeeded to get Mr. Modeno on the phone, during which he received a

promise that Mr. Modeno will get back to him. No action or followup communication was ever received from Mr. Modeno or any other FTB agent.

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

Finally, on 11/17/2022, Dr. Golshani sent an email to Mr. Yousef to inform him of this oversight; however, no response was received from Mr. Yousef either. This horrendous lack of regards for the normal FTB policy and procedures is shameful. U.S. taxpayers would be appalled to note that FTB is willing to use their tax dollars to prepare and send multiple agents to this court to fight and appeal the honest taxpayer, and that for a measly sum \$21,000, instead of negotiating the settlement, whereas negotiating the settlement may have taken an hour or two of one FTB agent. It seems the "got you" mentality of FTB has amassed a considerably larger expense than the dollar amount in dispute. When one adds up, the number of days that they have spent to prepare for and participate in this hearing.

In summary, the Respondent's plea should be rejected for the following reasons: One, the Respondent has chosen to ignore the importance of the fact that housing is a basic right of every citizen. It assumes that the Paradise Valley house, which was the only home owned by the Appellant, was not the Appellant's primary

residence. Then any fair-minded person who understands basic human rights would conclude that, because housing is a basic right, that California rental costs are absolute necessities for a direct burden of the Arizona rental property. Contrary to mischaracterization of FTB, this is not a household cost issue. This is a basic human right issue.

Number two, the Respondent has failed to show that the Paradise Valley house was not the primary resident of the Appellants. The term "primary" is relevant only if a person owns a secondary home that can be his or her residence. In the case of millions of other U.S. taxpayers who own only one home and may have rental income, IRS does not question whether this is a primary residence or not. Should FTB choose to ignore the Appellant's cost of renting an alternative place, as they have, at the time of retraction of some of the prior statements by the Appellant would leave no option but to accept the Paradise Valley property as the Appellant's primary residence.

Number three, the Respondent has overestimated the Appellant's gains by: A, dismissing a large portion of the submitted expenses associated with rebuilding the house by at least \$100,000; and B, not considering the perpetual deficit -- by not -- and B, not considering

the perpetual deficit for rent income, as compared to mortgage, as a loss that should eventually be reduced -- that should eventually reduce the computed gains.

2.4

Number four, the Respondent failed to engage in a good faith effort to negotiate a fair settlement for the disputed amount. This seemingly arrogant violation of Appellant's rights, as defined from settling the case amicably, and potentially has burdened the U.S. or California taxpayers with tens of thousands of dollars that could have been saved by crafting the settlement prior to these hearings.

Five, in 2020, Dr. Golshani lost his job as dean, and his salary of around \$263,000 was reduced to \$139,000. This involuntary deduction of income by nearly one half has devastated the appellant's finances, and as such, they will not be able to pay the money that the government is pressuring them to pay.

I hope the esteemed judges will consider the humanity of the situation. None of the matters surrounding this case would have been relevant if it weren't for the 2008 recession. The Appellant did not choose to be a landlord. They intended to simply sell one house and buy another; however, the circumstances caused by recession forced them to rent the property at

1 a perpetual loss. When so many other foreclosed and 2 filed bankruptcy, meaning they paid no taxes, the 3 Appellant made it work out somehow, someway. Month after month, they subsidized the deficit rental income 4 5 by their hard-earned civil servant salary and chose not to seek foreclosure and bankruptcy, which, as you all 6 know, would have further exacerbated the ongoing 7 Because they are simple, honest taxpayers, 8 recession. 9 who earned their income via state paychecks. They did 10 not contemplate finding the loophole that so many others, correctly or incorrectly, pursued, so that they 11 would pay no taxes. This is a travesty. 12 It's a 13 travesty for the Appellants to be penalized for their 14 adherence to the basic principals for honesty. 15 On behalf of the Golshani family, I thank you for your time and consideration. 16 17 JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank you 18 for your presentation, Mr. Golshani. 19 I'd like to turn it over to FTB. Mr. Iranpour, 20 are you ready to begin your presentation? Please begin. 21 And just to note -- I'm so sorry. Earlier, in 22 terms of the time, you will see have 20 minutes for your 23 presentation.

MR. IRANPOUR: Thank you.

2.4

25

///

## PRESENTATION

2.4

MR. IRANPOUR: Good afternoon, Judges. This is a tuition (phonetic) appeal spanning three taxable years. The first issue, concerning tax years 2015 and 2016, is whether FTB was correct to suspend Appellant's passive activity losses after discovering he didn't have a passive income in those years to take those losses. The second issue, concerning tax year 2017, is whether Appellant owed tax upon the 2017 sale of his Arizona rental property.

Forouzan Golshani was a California resident during the taxable years at issue. Prior to moving to California in 2008 to start a new job, Appellant lived in Arizona in a property he owned. After moving to California in 2008, Appellant kept the Arizona rental property and began renting it, from 2009 until it was sold in 2017. For both tax years 2015 and 2016, Appellant claimed nearly \$59,000 in rental losses. FTB did not disallow the rental losses, but merely suspended them to tax year 2017, as Appellant did not have sufficient passive income in those years to take the losses and had used -- had improperly applied them against his W-2 wages.

Regarding the 2015 and 2016 passive loss suspensions, Appellant has not raised illegal contention

showing error. In 2017, Appellant sold the Arizona rental property, reporting a sales price of approximately 1.72 million and an adjusted basis of approximately 1.38 million. The resulting \$338,000 gain, Appellant excluded under Section 121, Gain Exclusion, and ultimately reported zero dollars gain on the sale. FTB disallowed Section 121 exclusion because the Arizona rental property did not qualify as a principal residence.

In response, Appellant represented that FTB accounted for \$109,000 in selling expenses he did not previously account for. FTB granted the request, reducing the gain from \$338,000 to approximately \$228,000. Appellant then raised the following two contentions: One, that no tax was due, because he executed Section 1031 like-kind exchange; and two, that no tax was due, because the rent and other household expenses he paid for his primary residence constituted a deductible business expense, which, in turn, should offset the resulting gain.

I will now address both issues and their company contentions. Issue number one, 2015 and 2016 passive loss suspensions. IRS Section 469 prohibits taxpayers from using passive activity losses to reduce their non-passive income. Unused passive activity losses are

generally suspended and carried forward to either a future tax year to offset the passive income in that year, or to the year of disposition. The term "passive activity" expressly includes any rental activity. A limited exemption allows taxpayers to deduct up to \$25,000 in passive income from their non-passive income, and passive losses from their non-passive income. This exemption begins to phase out when a taxpayer's modified adjusted gross income exceeds \$100,000 and completely phases out after \$150,000.

Here, FTB correctly determined that Appellant's rental activity constituted passive activity, subject to the Section 469 rules. And as such, Appellant was not allowed to use his passive activity losses to offset his W-2 wages. Furthermore, Appellant did not qualify for the \$25,000 exemption, because his modified adjusted gross income for tax year 2015 and 2016 exceeded the \$150,000 limit by nearly \$100,000. Because Appellant was completely phased out of the exemption, FTB correctly suspended the 2015 and 2016 rental losses and properly applied them to tax year 2017, the year of disposition, to offset the gain from the sale of his Arizona property. Because Appellant has not and cannot cannot show error with FTB's position, the 2015 and 2016 tax assessments should be sustained.

Turning to issue number 2 and whether Appellant owed tax upon the 2017 sale of his Arizona property, as indicated before, Mr. Golshani raised three possible contentions for why he believes he does not owe tax for the 2017 sale for the Arizona property: One, because the gain was excludable under Section 121; two, because he executed a Section 1031 life-kind exchange; and three, because his rent and other household expenses constituted a deductible expense.

IRS Section 121 allows taxpayers to exclude up to \$250,000 of gain or \$500,000 if filing jointly from the sale of your principal residence, if in the last five years of ownership, the taxpayer uses the property as the primary residence for a period of at least two years. Here, Appellant has been using the property as a rental property for a period of nine years leading up to the 2017 sale. During that time, Appellant was living and working in California with his family and never lived in the Arizona property after moving to California in 2008. Because Appellant did not live in the Arizona property, much less use it as his principal residence, Appellant did not satisfy the principal residence test.

And FTB was correct. This allowed the gain exclusion Appellant had previously claimed. Next, Appellant argued he had executed Section 1031 life-kind

exchange; however, Appellant failed to meet almost every requirement. One, he did not use a qualified intermediary, causing him to actually and impermissibly receive the cash proceeds from the Arizona property sale. Two, Appellant did not follow the 45-day identification rule for replacement property; and three, did not prove the Rolling Hills home subsequently purchased was investment property. Failing any one of these requirements would have caused the exchange to fail. Here, Appellant failed three.

Additionally, Appellant did not file a federal Form 8824 with the IRS to report the alleged 1031 exchange. And, finally, Appellant argues that his rent payments and related household expenses constituted a business expense. Prior to purchasing his Rolling Hills home in 2018, Appellant was a renter. Appellant argues the rent he paid his landlord to house himself and family and other household expenses constituted a business expense because he had to vacate the Arizona property in order to rent it. First, Appellant has repeatedly conceded that he moved to California to 2008 to start a new job, not to make the Arizona property available for rent, as he is now alleging. Even if he had, however, IRS Section 2622 denies deductions for personal household expenses.

Treasury rents specify that rent, among others, is a personal household expense. The number of properties that a taxpayer owns and offers for rent, and the reasons why taxpayer pays rent for a personal residence are irrelevant. Personal household expenses cannot be deducted. The applicable laws, without a doubt, refute his argument on appeal.

2.4

The only instance that allows a taxpayer to deduct rental payments of similar expenses from a personal residence occurs when a taxpayer uses part of the personal residence as a place of business. Here, no portion of Appellant's California residence was ever exclusively used in a business, so that a portion of the rental payments were made for a business purpose.

Because Appellant's recontention seeking to exclude gain under Section 121, Section 1031, and Section 261 all fail. GTB -- FTB correctly determined that Appellant owed tax upon the 2017 sale of his Arizona rental property. Accordingly, the 2017 tax assessment should also be sustained.

This concludes FTB's presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions that I may have.

JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank you,
Mr. Iranpour. I do not have any questions. I'd like to
turn it over to my co-panelist. Judge Lam, do you have

any questions?

JUDGE LAM: This is Judge Lam speaking. I do not have any questions.

JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank you. Judge Le, do you have any questions?

JUDGE LE: This is Judge Le. I also don't have any questions.

JUDGE KLETTER: Okay. Thank you so much. This is Judge Kletter. Mr. Golshani, would you like to make a rebuttal to what Mr. Iranpour said or any final statement? Please begin.

MR. GOLSHANI: Can I ask a question as well or not?

JUDGE KLETTER: You can ask a question.

2.4

## CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. GOLSHANI: This combination of rent and other household expenses that is constantly referred to, there is no other household expenses that is in discussion here. It's only the rent expenses caused by us being forced to leave the house in Arizona and nothing else. So I just want to make sure that it is clear, that we never made any such presentation to FTB. And other than rent, there was nothing that you wanted to be considered for, basically reducing our tax burden. It was only rent that we were paying.

The other statement I want to make is that the interactions I have had with FTB, they have asked questions, and I've provided them with responses. None of the sections in that code mean anything to me. And it's from my perspective, it is just expenses, out-of-pocket expenses, over the years, that causes us to feel this has been a drain on everything that we have For ten years, we have had to put up with this. The math does not make sense when you consider the deficit and the monies that were collected. And I don't know how or where it goes. I do not know where the actual out-of-pocket money from the salary going to cover the expenses in so-called investment property. How come at the end of the transaction, these do not show up? Because in my calculations, we are way, way under money received versus what we paid out to maintain this house and sell it eventually. This is what I wanted to say.

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

The closing statement, again, we believe that the law of the land entitle us to a place to live. If FTB says, "Well, okay. You rent, you're a landlord. You're renting that property," the other side of it is, where do you live? What do you do? When it's the right of every citizen to have housing security. How does that -- how is that -- I'm sorry. I made my argument,

1	that this has been a loss, a complete loss, for many
2	years, and for us to be forced this money now is just
3	total injustice. Thank you.
4	JUDGE KLETTER: Thank you Mr. Golshani.
5	Mr. Iranpour, would you like to make a final
6	statement, or would you like to say anything before the
7	case is submitted?
8	MR. IRANPOUR: I would. Thank you.
9	JUDGE KLETTER: And this is Judge Kletter. Just
LO	want to turn it over to my panelists again. No
11	questions from me, but Judge Lam, do you have questions
L2	for either of the parties?
13	JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Lam speaking. I
L4	don't have any questions, but thank you, Appellant, for
15	your wonderful presentation.
16	JUDGE KLETTER: Okay. And then, Judge Le, do you
L7	have any questions?
18	JUDGE LE: I think the tax agency wants to to say
L9	something.
20	MR. IRANPOUR: Yeah, I said I would.
21	JUDGE KLETTER: Oh, I'm sorry.
22	MR. IRANPOUR: Yeah, thank you.
23	
24	CLOSING STATEMENT
25	MR. IRANPOUR: Appellant has moved to California to

2008 to start a new job. Keeping his Arizona property and renting it out from 2009 through its 2017 sales date. For tax years 2015 and 2016, Appellant improperly uses medical activity losses to offset his W-2 wages and other non-passive income. Because Appellants modified AGR for tax years 2015 and 2016 exceeded the \$150000-dollar-a-year limit, Appellant was completely phased out of the \$25,000 passive activity loss exemption. And therefore, FTB was correct to suspend his 2015 and 2016 rental losses and apply them to tax year 2017, the year of disposition, to offset his gain from the sale of the Arizona property. Because Dr. Golshani cannot show error with FTB's position, OTA should sustain 2015 and 2016 tax assessments.

Regarding tax years 2017 and whether Appellant owed tax upon his 2017 sale of his Arizona property, Appellant has raised three alternative contentions: that no tax was due under Section 121 gain exclusion, that no tax was due under Section 1031 like-kind exchange, and that no tax was due because his personal rent qualified his business expenses, which, in turn, should offset the gain.

Regarding Section 121, FTB demonstrated Appellant did not qualify for gain exclusion, because the Arizona property did not qualify as a principal residence.

1 Regarding Section 1031, FTB showed that Appellant did 2 not qualify for gain deferral, because he violated 3 several of the provisions, including, one, actually 4 receiving cash flow proceeds from the sale; two, failing 5 to comply with the 45-day replacement property identification rule; and three, failing to prove that 6 7 the Rolling Hills property, subsequent to purchase, was held for investment purposes. Appellant also failed to 8 9 file Federal Form 8824 to report the alleged temporary 10 home exchange to the IRS. And finally, regarding 11 personal rent as a qualifying business expense, FTB demonstrated the law is well-settled in this area, and 12 13 that such expenses aren't inherently personal and do not 14 qualify as business expenses under the law. Thank you. 15 Thank you, Judge. We're done. MR. HUNTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank you 16 JUDGE KLETTER: 17 so much. Sorry. I misheard you earlier. I have no 18 questions. Just wanted to ask my panelists again. 19 Judge Lam, do you have any questions? 20 This is Judge Lam speaking. JUDGE LAM: No questions. 21 22 JUDGE KLETTER: And then, Judge Le, do you have any 23 questions? 2.4 No questions. Thank you. JUDGE LE:

JUDGE KLETTER: Okay. Thank you to both of the

25

parties for their presentation today. This concludes the hearing, and the administrative law judges will meet and decide the case based on the arguments that were presented today and the documents in the record. will issue our written decision no later than 100 days from today. This case is submitted and the record is now closed. This concludes this hearing session, and the incident hearing session will begin at 2:00 P M. Thanks to everyone. (HEARING CONCLUDED AT 1:47 P.M.) 2.4 

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
4	) ss COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )
5	
6	
7	
8	I, SKYY CHUNG, hearing reporter in and for the
9	State of California, county of Los Angeles, do hereby
LO	certify that the foregoing transcript is a full, true,
11	and correct statement of the proceedings had in said
L2	cause.
13	
L4	
15	DATED: FEBRUARY 14, 2023
L6	And al
L7	
18	Hearing Reporter
L9	
20	SKYY CHUNG
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

\$	<b>100</b> 30:5 <b>1031</b> 20:16 22:7,	17,20 20:1 21:21 22:2,5,17 24:18,	<b>942840</b> 3:6
<b>C4</b> 40 45 44 0	25 23:12 24:16	19 28:2,11,15,16	A
<b>\$1</b> 10:15 11:6	28:19 29:1	<b>2018</b> 23:16	A C 4.5
<b>\$1.4</b> 10:16	<b>1099</b> 9:24	<b>2020</b> 14:18 17:13	<b>A-S</b> 4:5
<b>\$1.72</b> 12:10	<b>11/17/2022</b> 15:4	<b>2022</b> 14:19	absolute 16:4
<b>\$1.75</b> 12:3	<b>121</b> 20:5,7 22:6,10 24:16 28:18,23	<b>2023</b> 2:17 5:1,7 7:4	academic 9:9
<b>\$100,000</b> 16:24 21:9,18	<b>14</b> 2:17 5:1	<b>21067910</b> 5:6	accept 14:7 16:19
<b>\$109,000</b> 20:11			acceptable 14:6
<b>\$110,000</b> 12:11	<b>14th</b> 5:6	<b>25</b> 4:18	accepted 10:19
<b>\$12,000</b> 12:24	<b>19</b> 4:13 7:4	<b>261</b> 24:17	accompanying 6:20
<b>\$139,000</b> 17:15	<b>1944</b> 8:2	<b>2622</b> 23:24	account 20:12
<b>\$150,000</b> 17:13	<b>1948</b> 8:3	<b>27</b> 4:19	accounted 20:11
13:1 21:10,18	<b>1966</b> 8:9	<b>2:00</b> 30:8	accounting
\$150000-dollar-	<b>1984</b> 9:7,10	3	12:14
<b>a-year</b> 28:7	<b>1995</b> 10:9		acquired 10:8
<b>\$21,000</b> 15:12	<b>1:05</b> 2:16 5:2,7	<b>3.5</b> 10:24	action 15:1
<b>\$228,000</b> 20:14	<b>1:47</b> 30:10	<b>30</b> 11:17	<b>active</b> 11:13
<b>\$25</b> 7:1	2	4	activities 11:6
<b>\$25,000</b> 21:6,16			activity 9:23 19:6
28:8	<b>2</b> 22:1	<b>45-day</b> 23:5 29:5	20:24,25 21:4,12,
<b>\$250,000</b> 22:11	<b>20</b> 6:7 18:22	<b>469</b> 20:23 21:13	14 28:4,8
<b>\$263,000</b> 17:14	<b>2004</b> 10:11		<b>actual</b> 26:12
<b>\$338,000</b> 20:4,13	<b>2007</b> 10:17	5	<b>additional</b> 5:22 6:5 7:5,8 12:5,15
<b>\$3500</b> 11:22	<b>2008</b> 10:16,23	50-plus-year-old	Additionally
<b>\$42,000</b> 11:22 12:25	12:22 13:5 17:22 19:13,15 22:20	10:12	23:11
<b>\$500,000</b> 22:11	23:21 28:1		address 8:2
<b>\$59,000</b> 19:18	<b>2009</b> 9:21 19:16	6	20:21
<b>\$750</b> 13:15	28:2	<b>6</b> 4:5,12	<b>adds</b> 15:17
<b>ψ130</b> 13.13	<b>2015</b> 5:23 19:4,17, 24 20:22 21:17,		<b>adequate</b> 8:5,6,7 14:9
1	20,24 28:3,6,10,	<u> </u>	adhere 8:21
1 20 20.4	14	<b>800 852-5711</b> 3:7	adherence 18:14
<b>1.38</b> 20:4	<b>2016</b> 5:23 19:4,17, 24 20:22 21:17,	<b>8824</b> 23:12 29:9	adjusted 20:3
<b>1.4</b> 12:6,14	20,24 28:3,6,10,		21:9,16
<b>1.72</b> 20:3	14	9	administrative
<b>10</b> 11:18	<b>2017</b> 5:23 10:10 12:10,23 19:8,9,	<b>94240</b> 3:7	5:10,11 30:2

Index: ADMITTED..caused

**ADMITTED** 4:5 billions 13:14 11,13,16,20 24:18 assistant 9:10 6:3 27:14,25 28:3,7, associate 9:11 binding 8:8 15,17,23 29:1,8 afternoon 5:17 **assumes** 15:23 block 8:25 9:3 19:2 appellant's 10:7 13:19 astounding 11:3 15:25 16:16,20,22 agency 27:18 17:8,16 19:5 **Board** 3:6 5:19 attempt 7:21 agent 14:22 15:3, 21:11 24:12,15 **bottom** 11:1 14 attempted 13:24 Appellants 9:5, bounce 12:7 **agents** 13:22 17 10:8 11:19 attempts 14:19, 12:23 13:2,9,17, **Box** 3:6 15:10 24 21 14:7 16:10 agonizing 12:6 builder 12:21 attorney 14:22 18:13 28:5 **AGR** 28:6 audit 8:24 building 12:16 applicable 7:20 8:21 24:6 albeit 14:4 **built** 12:18 automatically 9:14 application 14:8 alleged 23:12 burden 16:4 29:9 Aviation 6:25 25:24 applied 19:22 21:21 alleging 23:23 burdened 17:9 В **apply** 28:10 allowed 21:14 business 9:23 22:23 20:19 23:15.19 approximately back 12:7 15:1 24:11,13,14 28:21 alternative 16:16 5:7 12:24 13:1 29:11,14 background 7:25 28:17 20:3,4,13 buy 10:20 17:24 bailed 13:6 area 29:12 amassed 15:15 bailouts 13:7 argued 22:25 amicably 17:9 C bankruptcy 18:2, argues 23:13,16 **amount** 12:23 15:16 17:7 **CA** 3:7 argument 4:16 **based** 30:3 24:7 26:25 Angeles 6:24 calculations **basic** 7:14,17 26:15 arguments 30:3 **annual** 12:23 15:23 16:2,3,7 California 2:2,16 appalled 15:9 Arizona 10:9 18:14 5:1.8 8:11 10:18. 11:2,5 16:4 19:9, appeal 2:5 5:5,10 basically 25:24 20 14:3 16:3 14,15 20:1,8 15:11 19:3 24:7 17:10 19:11,13,15 21:23 22:2,5,19, **basis** 20:3 22:18,19 23:21 20 23:4,19,22 APPEALS 2:1 24:12 27:25 **Beach** 10:18 24:19 25:20 28:1, **APPEARANCES** 12,16,24 calls 14:21 began 19:16 3:1 arrogant 17:7 begin 6:8 9:5 capital 11:20 13:3 Appellant 2:7 18:20 25:11 30:8 **ASAF** 3:2 5:14,21,25 6:4,17 carried 21:1 7:4,15 8:15 10:11 ascended 9:10 beginning 5:13 **case** 5:6 7:13 11:11,19,25 12:13 11:17 8:22.23 10:3 assessed 11:20 13:8 15:25 16:18 begins 21:8 16:12 17:8,21 13:3 17:22 18:3 19:9, 27:7 30:3,6 13,15,18,20,25 behalf 6:17 18:15 assessment 5:22 20:1,5,10,14 cash 23:4 29:4 24:20 believes 22:4 21:13,15,18,23 caused 11:4 assessments 22:1,15,17,20,22, Bill 7:23 17:25 23:9 25:19 21:25 28:14 24,25 23:1,5,10,

decided 10:12,19 causing 23:3 commencing contemplate 2:16 18:10 12:17 Cero 14:21 contemplated decision 30:5 commission Cerritos 2:16 5:1. 6:25 12:11 9:22 declaration 8:1,4 commissioner contention 19:25 chair 9:12 deduct 21:5 24:9 6:24 contentions deducted 9:14 **choice** 8:15,17 common 13:4 20:15,22 22:4 24:6 28:17 **choose** 16:15 communication deductible 20:19 17:23 15:2 Contrary 16:5 22:9 **chose** 18:5 company 20:21 control 8:19 deduction 12:10 **chosen** 15:22 compared 17:1 corollary 14:3 17:15 **Chung** 2:18 deductions compensated correct 19:5 circumstances 7:2 22:23 28:9 23:24 17:24 complete 27:1 correctly 10:7 deferral 29:2 citizen 8:2 15:23 18:11 21:11,20 completed 10:23 deficit 16:25 17:1 26:24 24:17 18:4 26:10 completely 13:16 **civic** 6:24 cost 12:5 16:6,16 21:9,19 28:7 **defined** 7:15 17:8 civil 9:8 13:10,11 costs 12:11 16:3 demolish 10:12 comply 29:5 18:5 Counsels 6:14 demonstrated component 8:5 **claim** 13:14 28:23 29:12 County 6:24 computed 17:3 claimed 19:18 court 7:6 15:11 denies 23:24 22:24 conceded 23:21 Covenant 8:8 department 3:5 clear 12:14 25:21 conclude 16:2 9:12 cover 12:3 26:13 client's 9:4 **CONCLUDED DEPARTMENT'S** 30:10 crafting 17:11 **close** 12:1 4:5 concludes 24:21 Cultural 8:9 closed 30:7 design 11:7 30:1,7 desperate 11:7, closing 4:16 conservative 9:4 D 12:11 25:15 26:19 12 considerably 27:24 determined date 28:3 7:10 15:16 co-panelist 24:25 21:11 24:17 dated 7:3 consideration devastated 17:16 code 7:19 26:4 7:16 18:16 David 3:5 5:18 codes 7:16 8:22 deviations 7:19 considered 7:17 days 15:17 30:5 codified 8:7 25:23 difference 14:11 dean 9:12 10:18 constantly 25:17 direct 16:4 collapse 11:4 17:13 disallow 12:17 collected 13:8 constituted decades 9:17 20:18 21:12 22:9 19:19 26:10 December 12:9 23:14,18 college 9:12 disallowed 20:7 decent 7:24 8:3 consulting 9:24 10:17 discovering 19:6 decide 30:3 combination contact 14:23 discussion 25:18 25:16

dismissing 16:22 11:15 expanding 10:14 **final** 11:18 25:10 27:5 disposition 21:3, entitle 26:20 expense 15:16 22 28:11 20:19 22:9 23:15, **finally** 15:4 23:13 error 5:21 20:1 19 24:2 29:11 29:10 dispute 15:17 21:24 28:13 expenses 12:18, finances 17:16 disputed 17:7 **estate** 13:22 20 16:23 20:11,18 financially 9:2 distressed 11:12 esteemed 6:13 22:8 23:14,18,25 10:4 17:19 24:5,9 25:17,18, **finding** 18:10 documents 7:5,8 19 26:5,6,13 estimate 12:2 fixtures 12:20 30:4 28:21 29:13,14 dollar 15:16 estimated 10:15 flabbergasted expressly 21:4 12:6 11:20 dollars 10:24 12:5 extend 6:21 13:2.7.14 15:10 ethics 8:22 flow 29:4 17:10 20:6 evening 6:20 **follow** 23:5 F doubt 24:7 eventually 12:9 followup 15:2 drain 26:7 17:2,3 26:17 face 8:25 forced 8:16,18 due 20:15.17 evidentiary 5:24 11:8.24 13:17 fact 9:15 15:22 17:25 25:20 27:2 28:18,19,20 exacerbated facts 9:3 10:6 duties 6:24 18:7 foreclosed 18:1 fail 23:10 24:17 exceeded 21:17 foreclosure 18:6 failed 16:8 17:5 Ε 28:6 forefront 8:11 23:1,10 29:8 exceeds 21:9 forewarned earlier 12:25 failing 23:8 29:4,6 exception 9:16 13:20 18:21 29:17 fair 17:6 exchange 13:18, Form 23:12 29:9 earned 18:9 fair-minded 16:1 25 20:16 22:7 formal 13:18 Economic 8:9 23:1,9,13 28:19 **fairly** 8:13 29:10 forms 9:25 10:1 **Eddy** 3:3 5:11 **faith** 17:6 excludable 22:6 Forouzan 2:6 education 9:9 fallen 11:1 5:15 6:13,17 exclude 22:10 effort 6:16 17:6 19:11 family 9:25 10:14, 24:16 efforts 12:1 19,20 18:15 22:18 forward 21:1 excluded 20:5 23:18 **email** 15:5 found 7:20 11:9 exclusion 20:6,7 February 2:17 emphasize 8:14 22:24 28:18,24 Franchise 3:6 5:1.6 5:19 employee 9:13 exclusively federal 9:18 23:11 24:13 Franklin 8:1 end 26:14 29:9 executed 13:25 frantic 11:12 feel 26:7 ended 10:15 20:16 22:7,25 friend's 9:1 ends 11:7 fight 15:11 exemption 21:5, FTB 5:24 6:14 engage 17:5 file 23:11 29:9 8,16,19 28:9 7:14,22 10:8 11:9 **filed** 18:2 engaged 9:8 **exhibits** 4:5 5:24 12:16 14:5,20,22 6:1,3,5 15:3,8,9,14,15 entered 6:1 filing 9:19 10:8 16:6,15 18:19 22:11 existed 11:16 entire 9:13,25 19:5,18 20:7,10,

**inform** 7:7 15:5 12 21:11,19 22:23 happy 24:21 **Hunter** 3:5 5:18 24:17 25:22 26:2, 29:15 hard-earned 18:5 informed 13:21 20 28:9,23 29:1, husband 9:7 hearing 2:18 5:8 inherently 29:13 15:19 30:2,7,8,10 FTB's 5:22 10:4 initial 12:4 ı 21:24 24:21 28:13 hearings 17:12 injustice 27:3 **full** 9:11 held 29:8 ICESCR 8:9 instance 24:8 **fully** 14:7 **higher** 11:16 identification intend 7:10.12 23:6 29:6 **funds** 13:7 highly 9:3 intended 17:23 identified 14:22 future 21:2 Hills 23:7,15 29:7 interactions 26:2 identify 5:12 holding 5:8 intermediary G ignorance 14:8 home 8:3 10:20 14:1,11 23:3 13:17 14:2 15:24 **ignore** 15:22 International 8:8 **gain** 20:5,6,13,20 16:11,13 23:7,16 16:15 21:22 22:6,11,23 29:10 interpretation 24:16 28:11,18, **illegal** 19:25 10:5 homemaker 9:6 22,24 29:2 immigrated 9:7 interrupt 14:13 homeowners **gains** 11:20 13:3 impart 7:12 13:16 introducing 9:5 16:22 17:4 impermissibly honest 8:20 13:23 investment generally 21:1 23:3 15:11 18:8 11:11,24 23:8 Golshani 2:6 26:13 29:8 implemented honesty 18:14 4:12,18 5:5,15,16 8:13 14:2,7 investments 6:7,10,13,17,19 hope 6:25 17:19 12:15 9:6,8,21 10:2,17 importance horrendous 15:7 14:13,16,19,24 15:22 investor 11:10 15:4 17:13 18:15, hour 15:14 important 7:2 18 19:11 22:3 investors 11:14 8:12,19 9:15,20 25:9,12,16 27:4 house 10:8,12,20, involuntary 22,23 11:8,16 28:13 imposed 14:10 17:15 12:1,9,16,19 14:4, Golshanis 11:8 improperly 19:22 5 15:24 16:9,24 involved 9:21 28:3 17:24 23:17 25:20 good 5:17 17:6 **Iranpour** 3:5 4:13, 26:17 19:2 incident 30:8 19 5:17,18 18:19, household 16:6 qovernment 13:6 24 19:2 24:24 includes 21:4 20:17 22:8 23:14, 17:18 25:10 27:5,8,20, including 29:3 18,25 24:2,5 22,25 granted 20:12 25:17,18 income 9:24,25 ironically 11:15 gross 21:9,17 13:11,12 16:14 **houses** 11:6 13:7 17:1,15 18:4,9 **GTB** 24:17 housing 7:25 8:5, irrelevant 24:5 19:7,21 20:25 7 11:2,5 15:23 21:2,6,7,9,17 28:5 IRS 9:2 16:14 16:2 26:24 Н 20:23 22:10 incorrectly 18:11 human 7:14,17 23:12,24 29:10 inevitable 12:20 half 17:16 8:4,5 16:2,7 **issue** 5:21 16:6,7 inexperienced hand 10:3 humanity 17:20 19:4,8,12 20:22 13:16 22:1 30:5 happened 12:22 hundred 12:4

<b>issues</b> 20:21	larger 15:16 lasted 10:16	lost 17:13	minutia 7:16,19 mischaracteriza
J	law 5:10,11 8:8	M	ion 16:5
January 7:4	14:6,8,9 26:20	<b>made</b> 11:25 12:7	misheard 29:17
job 17:13 19:13	29:12,14 30:2	14:19,21 18:3	misspelling 5:25
23:22 28:1	<b>laws</b> 7:18,24 8:21 24:6	24:14 25:22 26:25	Modeno 14:21,25
<b>John</b> 14:22	lawyers 7:14	maintain 26:16	15:1,3 <b>modified</b> 21:8,16
jointly 22:11	<b>Le</b> 3:2 5:11 25:5,6	<b>make</b> 11:7 13:14 23:22 25:9,21	28:5
judge 3:2,3 5:4,9,	27:16,18 29:22,24	26:1,9 27:5	money 17:17
10,20 6:4 14:13 18:17 24:23,25	lead 3:2 5:9	making 8:11	26:12,16 27:2
25:2,4,5,6,8,9,13	leading 22:16	margin 11:17	<b>monies</b> 26:10
27:4,9,11,13,16, 18,21 29:15,16,	leave 16:18 25:20	market 10:25	<b>month</b> 7:1 11:22 18:3,4
19,20,22,24,25	<b>left</b> 14:14	11:2,5 12:7 <b>math</b> 26:9	monthly 9:14
judges 5:11,17 6:14 10:4 17:19	<b>legal</b> 13:24	Matter 2:5	months 11:4 14:4
19:2 30:2	level 12:7	matters 17:20	mortgage 11:16
justice 8:12 13:4	life-kind 22:7,25		17:2
justification 14:9	<b>like-kind</b> 13:18,25 20:16 28:19	meaning 18:2 means 13:7	<b>moved</b> 23:21 27:25
K	limit 21:18 28:7	measly 15:12	moving 14:5
	limited 21:5	medical 28:4	19:12,14 22:19
<b>keen</b> 7:14	live 22:20 26:20,	meet 11:7 30:2	multiple 14:19,24
Keeping 28:1	23	meet almost	15:10
<b>Kletter</b> 3:2 5:4,9, 20 6:4 14:13	lived 19:13 22:19	23:1	N
18:17 24:23 25:4,	living 8:6 22:17	meeting 7:3	
8,9,13 27:4,9,13, 16,21 29:16,22,25	loan 12:15 logic 13:3	mentality 15:15	narrowly 7:15
	_	message 7:13	necessities 16:4
L	Long 10:18 loophole 18:10	Mike 3:2 5:11	necessity 13:20
lack 14:11 15:7	loopholes 13:12,	<b>million</b> 10:15,16, 24 11:6 12:3,6,10	<b>negotiate</b> 14:19 17:6
Lam 3:3 5:11	13	20:3,4	negotiating
24:25 25:2 27:11,	<b>Los</b> 6:24	million-dollar	15:12,13
13 29:19,20	loss 12:12 13:1	12:14	non-passive
land 26:20	17:2 18:1 19:24 20:23 27:1 28:8	millions 16:12 minimum 7:11	20:25 21:6,7 28:5
landlord 11:10 17:23 23:17 26:21	losses 11:23		normal 15:7
landlords 11:13	19:6,7,18,19,22	minor 9:24 minutes 6:7	<b>note</b> 8:19 15:9 18:21
large 16:22	20:24,25 21:7,14, 20 28:4,10	14:14 18:22	<b>number</b> 15:17 16:8,21 17:5

Index: numerous..property

20:22 22:1 24:2 panel 3:2 6:14 personal 23:25 presentation 10:3 24:2,4,5,10,11 4:10 6:8,12 7:12, numerous 12:19 28:20 29:11,13 21 14:15 18:18, panelists 27:10 20,23 19:1 24:21 perspective 26:5 29:18 0 25:22 27:15 30:1 paperwork 14:12 **phase** 21:8 presented 6:5 object 5:25 7:6,7 12:14 30:4 Paradise 10:8,22 **phased** 21:19 15:24 16:9,19 28:8 occurs 24:10 President 8:1 part 24:10 **phases** 21:10 offered 10:17 pressuring 17:18 participate 15:18 phone 14:20,25 offers 24:3 previously 20:12 participation phonetic 14:21, 22:24 OFFICE 2:1 6:23 23 19:3 **price** 12:1,3,8 offset 20:20 21:2, parties 5:12 27:12 pigeonhole 7:15 20:2 14,22 28:4,11,21 30:1 place 16:16 24:11 priced 11:6 ongoing 18:7 Parviz 3:5 5:18 26:20 primary 10:10 **option** 16:18 passive 11:10,14 plausible 10:21 15:25 16:9,10,15, order 23:20 20 20:18 22:14 19:5,7,21,24 **plea** 15:20 20:22,24,25 21:2, **OTA** 28:13 principal 8:12 3,6,7,12,14 28:8 pleased 7:7 20:9 22:12,21,22 out-of-pocket pay 11:25 17:17, 28:25 **PO** 3:6 12:15 26:6,12 18 18:12 point 7:18 8:14 principals 18:14 outrage 14:18 paychecks 9:15 9:15,20 10:7 prior 9:20 11:7 overage 9:19 18:9 12:13 14:17 16:18 17:12 19:12 overestimated 23:15 paying 25:25 points 14:5 16:21 procedures 15:8 payment 12:4 policy 15:8 overpaid 9:17 proceedings payments 23:14 **poorer** 11:23 oversight 15:5 24:9,14 2:15 6:15 7:9 portion 12:17 owe 22:4 proceeds 23:4 pays 24:4 16:22 24:12,13 29:4 owed 19:9 22:2 penalized 13:9 **position** 8:16,17 24:18 28:16 process 10:14,22 18:13 10:17,19 21:24 28:13 owned 15:25 professional 9:9 **penny** 10:1 19:14 potentially 17:9 percent 11:17,18 professor 9:10, ownership 22:13 preface 6:21 11 period 11:3 22:14, owns 16:11 24:3 profitable 10:21 prehearing 7:3 prohibits 20:23 permanent 12:20 prejudice 8:14 Ρ perpetual 16:25 prepare 15:10,18 promise 15:1 17:1 18:1 properly 21:21 p.m. 2:16 5:2,7 prepared 8:25 30:10 perpetually properties 24:3 preparers 13:19 11:21 **pace** 11:3 preparing 9:4 property 9:22 **person** 14:23 paid 7:1 10:1 12:2, 10:9,11 11:2 13:1 16:1,11 present 6:15,16 16:5,19 17:25 23 13:15 18:2 8:10 10:6 20:18 23:17 26:16 19:10,14,16 20:2,

8 21:23 22:2,5,13, refute 24:7 13:19,22,24,25 R 15,16,19,21 23:4, 23:9 regret 14:10 6,8,20,22 24:19 residence 10:10 26:13,22 28:1,12, rejected 15:21 raised 19:25 16:1,12,15,20 16,25 29:5,7 20:14 22:3 28:17 related 23:14 20:9,18 22:12,14, proposed 5:22 21,22 24:5,10,11, range 12:24 relevant 12:13 12 28:25 proud 6:23 16:11 17:21 ranks 9:11 resident 16:10 prove 23:7 29:6 remaining 14:15 ready 6:8 18:20 19:11 provide 12:21 rent 11:8,17 13:17 real 13:22 residential 10:11 14:4 17:1,25 provided 5:24 6:4 reality 11:21 respect 5:23 20:17 22:8 23:13, 26:3 17,20,23 24:1,3,4 reasoning 7:22 Respondent providing 6:22 25:16,19,23,25 15:21 16:8,21 reasons 15:21 26:21 28:20 29:11 provisions 8:11 17:5 24:4 rental 12:25 16:3, 29:3 Respondent's rebuild 10:13 5,14 18:4 19:10, public 6:23 15:20 15,18,19 20:2,8 rebuilding 10:14, response 15:6 21:4,12,20 22:16 purchase 29:7 22 12:5 16:23 24:9,14,19 28:10 20:10 purchased 14:2 **rebuilt** 12:19 renter 23:16 responses 26:3 23:8 rebuttal 25:10 purchasing renting 9:22 resulted 12:12 receive 23:4 23:15 16:16 19:16 26:22 resulting 20:4,20 28:2 received 10:4 purpose 24:14 retraction 16:17 14:25 15:2.6 rents 24:1 purposes 29:8 26:16 returns 8:24 9:4 repaid 9:19 pursued 7:22 receiving 29:4 review 7:6 repayments 9:19 18:11 recession 11:4 Rezvanieh 5:16 repeatedly 11:25 **put** 11:8 13:17 13:5 17:22,25 6:19 23:21 14:3 26:8 18:8 ridicule 9:1 replacement recognizing 8:5 Q 23:6 29:5 rights 7:14,23 8:4, recontention 9 16:2 17:8 report 23:12 29:9 24:15 qualified 23:2 rigidity 14:10 reported 2:17 28:20 record 5:4,5,13, 9:24,25 10:7 20:6 rigorous 14:7 24 6:2,3 30:4,6 qualify 20:8 21:15 Reporter 2:18 **Rolling** 23:7,15 28:24,25 29:2,14 reduce 17:3 20:24 29:7 reporting 20:2 qualifying 29:11 reduced 17:3,14 Roosevelt's 8:1 represented question 16:14 reducing 20:13 20:10 rule 23:6 29:6 25:12,13 25:24 representing rules 21:13 refer 11:10 questions 24:22, 5:19 6:14 24 25:1,3,5,7 26:3 reference 9:3 27:11,14,17 S request 20:12 29:18,19,21,23,24 referred 25:17 requirement 23:2 quote 9:1 Sacramento 3:7 referring 13:13 requirements

safeguard 7:24 **sheer** 12:12 started 9:10 Т **salary** 7:1 17:14 shocking 14:17 state 2:2 5:13 8:2, 18:5 26:12 10 9:13,18 10:18 **short** 11:21 target 12:3 18:9 **sale** 10:25 11:6 shorter 7:10 **tax** 2:1 3:6 5:19,23 19:9 20:7 21:22 stated 9:23 7:16 8:24 9:4,19 22:2,5,12,17 23:5 **show** 7:21 16:8 statement 6:16 11:21,25 13:3,7, 24:18 28:12,16 21:24 26:15 28:13 7:11,25 25:11,15 15,19 15:10 19:4, 29:4 showed 29:1 26:1,19 27:6,24 8,9,17,20 20:15, sales 20:2 28:2 17 21:2,17,21,25 showing 20:1 statements 16:18 22:2,4 24:18,19 satisfy 22:22 States 7:23 8:3 **shown** 5:21 25:24 27:18 28:3, **saved** 17:11 6,10,14,15,16,18, **side** 26:22 subject 21:12 19,20 secondary 16:11 submitted 12:18 signed 8:4 taxable 19:3,12 **Section** 20:5,7, 16:23 27:7 30:6 significant 12:17 16,23 21:13 22:6, taxed 10:1 subsequent 7:24 7,10,25 23:24 similar 24:9 29:7 taxes 5:22 9:2.14 24:16,17 28:18, **simple** 7:13 18:8 18:2,12 19,23 29:1 subsequently **simply** 9:23 11:12 9:12 23:7 taxpayer 8:20 sections 26:4 17:23 14:18 15:11 22:13 subsidize 12:25 security 26:24 24:3,4,8,10 sincere 6:21 subsidized 18:4 seek 18:6 taxpayer's 21:8 situation 8:18 succeeded 14:24 seeking 24:15 17:20 taxpayers 8:20 successfully 13:8,23 15:8 seemingly 10:21 **Skyy** 2:18 13:24 16:13 17:10 18:8 17:7 so-called 11:24 20:23 21:5 22:10 sufficient 19:21 **sell** 10:19 12:1 26:13 temporary 29:9 17:23 26:17 **suited** 10:13 **social** 8:9.12 ten 12:6 26:8 selling 20:11 sum 12:22 15:12 **sold** 12:9 13:1 tenant 11:9,16 **send** 15:10 19:17 20:1 summary 15:20 tens 17:10 sense 13:4 26:9 surprising 11:19 solely 13:10,11 term 16:10 21:3 servant 9:8 13:10, surrounding someway 18:3 11 18:5 17:21 terms 11:10 18:22 spanning 19:3 **service** 6:22 7:1,3 suspend 19:5 test 22:22 speaking 25:2 28:9 **session** 30:7,8 27:13 29:20 thirty-three 12:4 suspended 19:19 **set** 10:9 specifically 7:10, thousand 12:4 21:1,20 23 13:2 setting 12:8 suspensions **spent** 15:18 thousands 17:10 settlement 14:20 19:25 20:23 15:13 17:6,11 spiraling 11:3 time 5:7 6:16 7:3 sustain 28:14 8:10,24 9:13 settling 17:8 spirit 14:6 sustained 21:25 10:23 11:15 16:17 shameful 15:8 24:20 standard 8:6 18:16,22 22:17 shattered 7:18 start 8:16 19:13 times 8:21 23:22 28:1

Index: today.. Yousef

today 5:6,8,21 6:6 unsuccessful 30:1,4,6 Υ 14:20 **total** 11:4 27:3 unsuccessfully year 11:9,22 13:14 14:4 transaction 19:8,20 21:2,3,17, 13:21 26:14 **Unused** 20:25 21 28:11 **TRANSCRIPT** years 5:23 9:16 ٧ 2:15 11:18 12:7,24,25 19:3,4,7,12,17,21 transpired 10:5 **vacate** 23:19 22:13,15,16 26:6, travesty 18:12,13 8 27:2 28:3,6,15 Valley 10:9,22 Treasury 24:1 15:24 16:9,19 Yousef 14:23 15:5,6 treaty 8:8 **valued** 10:24 true 7:2 values 11:2 Tuesday 2:17 5:1, versus 26:16 **victims** 13:5 tuition 19:3 view 10:7 turn 18:19 20:19 violate 7:22 24:25 27:10 28:21 violated 29:2 Turning 22:1 violation 17:7 U virtually 11:5 **U.S.** 9:7 14:18 W 15:8 16:13 17:9 **UDHR** 8:4 **W-2** 9:25 13:10,11 19:23 21:15 28:4 ultimately 20:6 wages 19:23 unaware 13:18 21:15 28:4 understand 14:8 **wanted** 14:14 understands 25:23 26:18 29:18 16:1 well-settled unexpected 29:12 12:19 wife 6:19 Union 8:2 withholdings United 7:22 8:3 9:18 Universal 8:4 wonderful 27:15 universally 7:17 work 18:3 8:13 working 22:18 university 9:9 wrap 14:17 10:18 written 30:5 unlike 6:25 13:5