BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,)
DOOMID, INC.,)) File No. 19054812)
APPELLANT))
))

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Cerritos, California

Thursday, July 13, 2023

Reported by:

HANNA JENKIN, HEARING REPORTER

Job No.: 427310TA(A)

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,
6)
7	DOOMID, INC.,) File No. 19054812
8	APPELLANT)
9)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS,
15	taken at 12900 Park Plaza Drive, Suite 300, Cerritos,
16	California, commencing at 9:30 a.m. and concluding at
17	11:50 a.m. on Thursday, July 13, 2023, reported by
18	HANNA JENKIN, Hearing Reporter.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	Panel Lead:	ANDREW KWEE
3	Panel Members:	JOSH ALDRICH
4		SHERIENE RIDENOUR
5		
6	For the Appellant:	SHAHRIAR "SHAWN" NAZARI
7		
8	For the Department:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND
9		FEE ADMINISTRATION
10		
11		NALAN SAMARAWICKREMA, HEARING REP.
12		RAVENDER SHARMA, HEARING REP.
13		JASON PARKER, HEARING REP.
14		CHRISTOPHER BROOKS, TAX COUNSEL
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX
2	
3	EXHIBITS
4	(Department's Exhibits A-S were received at page 8.)
5	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-4 were received at page 9.)
6	
7	
8	PRESENTATION
9	PAGE
10	By Mr. Nazari 12
11	By Mr. Samarawickrema 46
12	
13	
14	CLOSING STATEMENT
15	PAGE
16	By Mr. Nazari 65
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Cerritos, California, Thursday, July 13, 2023 9:30 a.m.

2.4

JUDGE KWEE: Opening the record in the Appeal of Doomid, Inc., the rehearing matter. This matter is being held before the Office of Tax Appeals, the OTA Case Number is 19054812. Today is Thursday, July 13th, 2023 and the time is approximately 9:36 a.m.

Today's hearing is being live-streamed on OTA's YouTube channel. It is also been conducted in person in OTA's Cerritos, California Hearing offices.

Today's hearing is being heard by a panel of three Administrative Law Judges. My name is Andrew Kwee and I'll be the lead ALJ. Judge Josh Aldrich is to my right, he is the second member of this panel, and the third member of this panel is Judge Sheriene Ridenour, on my right.

All three judges will meet after the hearing and produce a written decision as equal participant and although I, as the lead judge, will be conducting this hearing, any judge on this panel may interrupt or ask questions at any time and otherwise participate equally to ensure that we have all the information needed to decide this appeal.

1	For the record, I'm going to ask the parties to
2	please identify themselves and who they represent.
3	And I'll start with the representatives for the
4	tax agency.
5	MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Nalan Samarawickrema, hearing
6	representative for the Department.
7	MR. PARKER: Jason Parker, Heath Chief of Operations
8	Bureau Headquarters, CDTFA.
9	MR. BROOKS: Christopher Brooks, attorney for CDTFA.
10	JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you. And the
11	representatives for Doomid Inc the representative for
12	Doomid Inc?
13	MR. NAZARI: Shawn Nazari for Doomid, Inc.
14	JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you. And I understand for
15	Doomid, Inc., the representative that you will also be
16	testifying, so you'll be the witness today.
17	So I will swear you in if you would raise your
18	hand.
19	S. NAZARI,
20	Produced as a witness, and having been first duly sworn by
21	The Administrative Law Judge, was examined and testified
22	as follows:
23	JUDGE KWEE: Thank you. You can put your hand down.
24	I'm just going to go over a couple of preliminary
25	matters, the first is the exhibits. For CDTFA we started

with an exhibit binder consisting of 1,146 pages -- 1,146 consisting of Exhibits A through R, those were the ones discussed at the prehearing conference. And Appellant had no procedural objections to admitting those exhibits into the evidentiary record.

After the prehearing conference, CDTFA submitted Exhibit S which brings the page count to 1,206 and that was in income tax returns for the entity.

CDTFA, did you have any additional exhibits? Or did that accurately summarize all of your exhibits for today's hearing?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Judge, you've correctly identified our exhibits.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. For Doomid, Inc., Mr. Nazari, did you receive the Exhibit S? And did you have any objections to admitting the additional exhibits into the evidentiary record?

MR. NAZARI: No.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. No objections?

MR. NAZARI: No.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. CDTFA's exhibit binder consisting of Exhibits A through S, which was distributed to the parties after the prehearing conference is admitted without objection.

25 ///

2.4

1 (Department's Exhibit A-S was received in 2 evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 3 JUDGE KWEE: I'll turn it over to Appellant's 4 exhibits. And Appellant also timely submitted exhibits 5 after the prehearing conference and that was 11 pages consisting of exhibits marked as A through D. 6 documents were documents which had previously been 7 submitted in the Petition for Rehearing Appeal before OTA. 8 9 Mr. Nazari, do you have any additional exhibits 10 or does that consist of all the exhibits you have for 11 today. Other exhibits I have are in the 12 MR. NAZARI: No. 13 state with the file. It's okay. We'll go by that. 14 JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Great. 15 CDTFA, do you have any objections to these four documents being admitted as evidence? 16 17 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: No objection. 18 JUDGE KWEE: Okay. And before I admit them I'm going 19 to mark them as Exhibits 1 through 4 just because we can't 20 have two Exhibit A's, and two Exhibit B's and two Exhibit C's and D's. 21 22 So taxpayers exhibits are just going to be marked 23 as A is going to be 1, B is 2, C is Exhibit 3, and D is 2.4 going to be marked as Exhibit 4 in OTA 's evidentiary

record for purposes of identification only.

25

1 And those documents are admitted as Exhibits 1 2 through 4 for the taxpayer without objection. 3 (Appellant's Exhibit 1-4 was received in 4 evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 5 JUDGE KWEE: Okay. During the prehearing conference, we had discussed the issues that were in appeal, and we 6 had also listed some additional items for clarification, 7 and sub-issues. The issues are also listed on the agenda, 8 9 they are listed in the minutes in order, so I'm not going 10 to repeat them right now, but I will ask the parties to 11 confirm that the minutes and orders correctly summarize the issues and the clarifications that were listed with 12 13 respect to those issues. CDTFA, is that also your understanding of that? 14 15 And it's an minutes and orders correctly summarized the 16 issues for appeal? 17 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yes, Judge. 18 JUDGE KWEE: For Appellant is that also your 19 understanding? 20 MR. NAZARI: Yes. 21 JUDGE KWEE: Okay. With that said, I have one clarification to make to the minutes and order. I noticed 22 23 that our -- OTA's opinion on the Petition for Rehearing matter noted that CDTFA withdrew their Petition for 2.4

Rehearing of the \$532 claim of refund for the 2000 -- the

25

first quarter of 2012, so I think that a sub-issue is outside of our jurisdiction, but I would like to confirm with CDTFA did you have any understanding of that?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: The claim for a refund is for the first quarter of 2012.

JUDGE KWEE: Yes.

2.4

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Yeah. And that is within the audit period and we are going to explain how we did the audit to show that we are disallowing that claim for refund.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. So I guess my question was that CDTFA had previously withdrew the Petition for Rehearing of that claim for a refund, so I wasn't sure then if OTA still had jurisdiction over that specific sub-issue. That was the question I had because we had in our opinion -- we had included a footnote too which had said that the board concurrently voted to deny a related claim for refund \$532 in tax for this matter, Board Case 626011, CDTFA timely Petition for Rehearing about decisions.

However, by a later date of November 8th, 2018 CDTFA withdrew its Petition for Rehearing of the board's decision to deny the refund claim. That was in OTA's opinion that is published on our website. So I wanted to -- so I was thinking that OTA might not have jurisdiction to hear that current appeal.

1 Did CDTFA have any objection with me pulling that 2 as a sub-issue? 3 MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: No objections. 4 JUDGE KWEE: And Mr. Nazari, is that also your understanding? Or do you have any objections with that 5 being pulled as a sub-issue? 6 7 MR. NAZARI: I'm sorry. I didn't --The \$532 claim for refund. 8 JUDGE KWEE: I think that's outside of OTA's jurisdiction because that wasn't 9 10 subject to this Petition for Rehearing of CDTFA. I listed that as a sub-issue, but I think that we do not have 11 jurisdiction. Do you have any objections? 12 13 MR. NAZART: No. 14 JUDGE KWEE: Great. Again, I apologize for the 15 confusion and that sub-issue \$532 claim for refund is struck as a sub-issue. 16 17 The last issue I was going to go over 18 before we get into the substance and turn over to the 19 parties is just a recap of the order of presentation. 20 have 40 minutes for Appellant's opening presentation and 21 testimony. And then after that, we will turn it over to 22 CDTFA and they have 30 minutes for their opening

Is that CDTFA 's understanding of the order of

presentation. After that, each party would be provided

five minutes for any closing remarks that they may have.

23

2.4

25

1	presentation for today?
2	MR. NAZARI: Yes, Judge, but we would like to combine
3	the opening and the closing remarks and use 35 minutes for
4	the opening.
5	JUDGE KWEE: Okay. We can strike CDTFA's final
6	rebuttal period and shift the time over to CDTFA's opening
7	presentation. The total time for the hearing is
8	unchanged.
9	Appellant, with that modification did you have
10	any changes that you would like to request?
11	MR. NAZARI: No, your Honor.
12	JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Then we are ready to proceed. The
13	time estimate is still an hour thirty. And I will turn it
14	over actually, I will first start with CDTFA.
15	CDTFA, did you have any other questions or
16	comments before we start the hearing?
17	MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: No, Judge.
18	JUDGE KWEE: Mr. Nazari, did you have any questions
19	before we turn it over to you for your opening
20	presentation?
21	MR. NAZARI: No, Judge.
22	JUDGE KWEE: Okay. The floor is yours, you may
23	proceed, you have 40 minutes.
24	PRESENTATION
25	MR. NAZARI: This audit is coming from a long story

with the background, it started in 2003 when I had opened the shop, it was doing just a mechanic and repair shop.

In 2005, we decided to --

JUDGE KWEE: Sorry. I'm getting feedback that they can't hear you on the livestream if you don't mind just moving the microphone a little closer to you it would be much appreciated. Thank you.

MR. NAZARI: In 2005 we decided -- I decided to get in the fuel business and I had no place to retail the fuel it, was all a hundred percent wholesale business.

And during 2006, we had a customer and we had two issues with this customer, some of them it was our fault and we didn't charge him, the person was wasn't charged an invoice and didn't charge the invoice for pre-prepayment sales tax. And when we corrected that part, we had an outstanding balance of 523 -- something thousand dollars.

The customer filed chapter 7 on us and we couldn't collect our money. It was kind of like, actually, we were hurting, the money out. We were owed the money for the fuel, the customer didn't pay, and the taxes we paid we can't collect.

We discussed it with our accountant, our accountant said, "You might be able to collect your prepayment sales tax, you pay it's uncollectible from the state." So we filed with the state, claimed \$64,000 of

taxes, then we paid and we could not collect it because the customer filed chapter 7.

We tried to kind of like salvage whatever we can because after a big loss we had, and we went and borrowed money on the property to pay the creditors and everything else. And at that time, we claimed \$64,000 refund from the state to pay the taxes that we couldn't collect. That resulted, we get the audit report -- audit notice, they were going to audit us, the books and records.

The first audit started, a state auditor looked at the situation we are in with the documents, they didn't show no interest in looking at the documents and what we were talking about. What they did, they sent some lady auditor to go through the books, add all the labor, parts, fuel, everything we sold, multiply by seven and a quarter tax rate, and hand us the bill, another \$500,000 on top of it.

So we contacted her supervisor, Mr. Prieto and told him this situation was happening, you know, she instead of looking at the claim, she's charging us another \$500,000 while we don't have no retail sale, everything was wholesale. So he admitted she has no experience and assigned another auditor to look at it.

And from the 2003 2006 says, "Okay. There was no tax due you guys are clean, but it's still the \$64,000

claim was a standard." So we finished that portion of it.

Then they came back, they wanted to audit us from the 6th to 8 in one year, we had his truck stop at that time, we opened a retail outlet to retail fuel. And 12, 14 months business, it wasn't that much paperwork. Just 12 month review report.

You easily can look at it look at the invoice. They wanted interest to look at the books and records. And as usual, they said, "Taxpayer didn't provide any books and records." We keep showing the papers, they keep saying, "Taxpayer didn't provide books and records. And we expect him to sell to so much and we get an average pricing multiply the gallons you sold," and not only they didn't credit us what we originally asked, they added another \$18,000 or \$20,000 liability on top of that.

So we dispute that determination and it was ongoing. I went to hearing board, and it's still going after 10, 20 years.

Then we get another notice for an audit from 9 to -- 9 to June 2012 because we actually asked they because as we got tired, we wanted to get out of the business.

You know, fuel business is no good, no profit.

They say we're going to audit it, so we received another audit notice, and they assigned the auditor,

Daniel Flores. And he started to audit our books and

records, he's the only one from the last 20 years kind of like acting fair and understanding.

Looked at the books, looked at the purchase sales data, and the fuel business has an excise tax goes on the SG report, it was like about a dollar difference with the -- what the vendor reported and what we reported. And everything else was a minor differences changed, you know, a few dollars here and there.

And the next thing we hear, we got a call from the Mr. Prieto, the supervisor, that he's no longer going to be your auditor. We're going to sign you another auditor.

So they assigned another auditor for the period of 2009 to June -- middle of 2012, Mr. Richard Consigli. He, from the beginning, he was kind of like had no interest in anything. We send him an e-mail, we sent him the paper, and we asked, "When would you like to see our books and records?" Then we can get down with this auditing nonsense.

And he gave us a date and he said he would like to see we can meet on such and such date. He also sent us an e-mail what he wants, what his requirement is, what he would like to see for the audit. He wanted to see 14 days of the pay period. He didn't want to see any books and records. He just wanted to see 14 shift paper, daily

sales in the audit period -- excuse me -- in that audit period and he wanted it all to be Mondays.

We were getting everything ready from the bank statement, to the income tax returns, they just recently produced that as Exhibit S. We had income tax returns from '09, '10, '11, '12 -- '11 because there was no '12 then because the audit was through June 2012.

We had boxes of the paper and everything was sitting right there ready, but he didn't want to look at it. He just wanted to see 12 Mondays.

So we don't know about the audit -- audit procedure, how it works. We were surprised that they were going to figure the whole business, three years of business by 12 weeks -- 12 days.

And I started to hire an attorney, I started to hire a CPA to do the audit with the state and get us out of. Anybody we had retained, CPA, after talking to auditors, they said that man doesn't like you, he really don't like you.

And other auditor was involved, I just don't want to throw the name in at this time. Because one of them, even in front of the employees, said, "I don't like Arabs." I said, "Good. I'm not Arab, I'm Persian." And he said, "Well, you guys all sand n-word," and the people all said, "What is what the hell is he talking about?"

He's really angry for what reason?"

Well first, accountant we had -- she said, "I can't handle it. This guy doesn't really like you." I said okay. So we pulled our papers back another week and discussed it with another CPA.

And this CPA -- we said, "Okay. We can retain him, we'll give him \$12,000, he takes the files and review it, everything." He calls and says, "I talk to auditor, he doesn't like you." What he is saying, you know, we can't do business with him.

So we took our paper back from him, went back to original accountant when he was doing all the income tax paperwork, Mr. Hoffman. So Mr. Hoffman sent a letter asking him for an appointment, when he would like to meet, And that was the original inquiry from us page 1086.

Because the history of the paperwork, the date is backed up for like June 6th of 2012 in Exhibit A, the other one is Exhibit M. And he responded, page number 458, the auditor responded to us what he would like.

On page 239, Mr. Hoffman, the CPA, proposed the Doomid audit at the time would be at his office on Thursday, November 12, at 1:30 p.m. They responded back from the auditor, it says, "I do not need to set any appointment. The information which was provided is not accurate," so he doesn't want to meet based on 12 Mondays

paper we gave him.

And if you look at page 171 and 172, that CPA, Mr. Hoffman, questioning him that how can you say the liability -- whatever, the accuracy of the audit without looking at other documents, like sales reports, or purchases.

You know, the grocery store we were paid to

Pepsi, Frito Lay, the audit was out there. Income tax

returns, bank statements, pay record. How can you finish

your audit without looking at those, but there is no

response from that guy. He didn't want to see it.

Prior to all this thing, we met with the auditor and he had us to sign the paper the extended time for audit period. We had to sign it and we are setting an appointment then he changed his mind, he didn't want to meet no more.

Then we get the audit results without examining any of the paperwork, any of the books, any discussion at all, and it started with him and it says he did three field tests a hundred percent agree with it. I personally think he is just lying, based on animosity, he doesn't like us.

He say he did three field tests on 8/16/2012 while we were waiting for him to come to the audit and 8/27/12 and 9/17/2012. And he has three readings and he

observed the prices at 4.17, 4.33 and 4.35 on those days and he compared it to the nation average pricing and he figured out -- the way he figured it out we were up average of \$0.07 below the national average pricing.

2.4

Then he got that figure, applies it to prior three years audit period and based on average he reported from the supplier and the garnishment reported from the purchase for retail. So they have a base gallonage, so he got the difference in national average goes back applied to three and a half years before that. And he create another \$500,000 liability.

So we asked for the determination and he said,
"Well this was an ad hoc report." He just had to do the
audit by what he had, even though he refused to look at
the paperwork, he had to estimate and finish his audit.
And you could find the determination that we can audit -look at your book later on, at a later date that is
paperwork.

With the information we went to the -- the page we were missing from the field audit -- he was an audit officer, and he looked at it, he looked at the paperwork he issued a DNR, he asked the auditor to recommend to be re-audit and let's look at the people's paper then and show me where the problem is.

So we waited for him to re-audit, but at that

time, he no longer -- I think he was no longer field auditor he became a supervisor, so he assigned another auditor for a re-audit named Mr. Dital (phonetic) and he manipulated the audit so bad. One of his file is like page 342.

He, instead of looked at the books -- the audit records because the audit man, you know, I'll say audit man also looked at point of sale electronic-generated paperwork, everything, so they were not interested to do that.

What he does, he goes and calls the suppliers get the invoices directly from suppliers. Then what he did is he left the sales tax in, left all the non-taxable fees and excise in, at \$0.02 per gallon for underground storage tank fee to come up with a cost. Then he compares the cost to the taxpayer filing taxable sale, so the taxable sale since you're selling fuel, like gasoline, is not something that I could buy \$10 gas and they charge me Okay. \$10 of gas and 82.50 -- \$0.83 for example -- whatever sales tax, now pay me \$10-- \$11.

The price you see on the pump is all taxes included, excise tax, sales tax, fuel tax, fuel, everything, sales tax, so you get all the tax included plus the \$0.02 additional, even the fee, come up with the cost comparing the taxable sales.

And then he says that, you know, what he sold was less than his purchase price, less than his cost. So validating the original audit that happened by the supervisor. Supervisor recommended the original first audit of 400 -- \$500,000 is good, no adjustment needed.

So we complain about that, we filed the petition. So the issue of the DNR and recommended reduce the taxes by so much. The SDNR recommended the reduced tax by so much and I don't know, bring it to three hundred-some thousand dollars and if you don't -- we looked at the SDNR was issued and we'll sit down and talk about it.

At the time we're paying it's 20,000, 30,000 bookkeeper, 20,000 just for that period. Just take your losses, accept this DNR, and hopefully we can go and compromise, see if we can somehow settle the debt with the state and go after our life.

We signed this DNR, accept it and send it in, and for some reason somebody, some person they didn't take it, they didn't accept it.

Next thing happened, we ended up to have a hearing from the state board member. We put all the documents back to the board and they look at it, they listen to argument, they recommended 30-30-30. Thirty days for us to send some paper to the state, thirty days for them to look at it, and then provide the result to the

board.

Again, they did the same thing. Instead of looking at the paper, they start to estimating and setting up the markup. They don't want to look at the actual sales because something is wrong with it, they don't like it. But they're trying to sell a purchases, plus markup, and anything else they can think of and send out the original audit by Richard Consigli is okay.

So the state -- we back to the board. The board members -- that was my exhibit that I send you. The board member, again, listened to -- they're going to have their own since they're still refusing to do the audit, they're going to have their own staff looked at it.

The staff looked at it with what they had and they made a decision on December, hearing in Sacramento and they run by the SDNR to reduce the tax 500 to 300, and to waive the penalty, and the original, the prior audit, they give me credit on that because half of half of what I was asking and I thought it was done.

Next thing I hear, they appealed it again. Now I look at the exhibit that provided, the second auditor kept saying that he didn't want to look at our paperwork, he collected his taken invoices from the supplier.

And if you look at the invoices, some of it is not even related to our purchases, like if you look at the

page 1081, going to the invoices, their auditor been using it to figure the cost.

It says, "Bill to Doomid, Inc., DBA Speedway
Travel Center," it's been the location we have been
retailing Mojave, California. The address on the bottom
of it, and then ship it to Doomid, Inc., DBA Speedway
Travel Center 6660 Sierra Highway, Mojave, California.

If you look at the invoice 1027 -- page 1027 from Mr. Strong, again, it says, "Speedway Doomid, Inc., PO box 752 Mojave, California, shipped sent to Speedway Truck Stop, Doomid, Inc., 6666 Sierra Highway, Mojave, California." So this part actually went to the location.

Then if you look at the page 1030, the majority of the evidence they sent in -- it says, "Bill to Doomid, Inc., PO box. I shipped to Doomid, Inc., Colton Truck Stop." Colton Truck Stop is -- I don't know -- 200 miles away from Mojave.

And if you look at page 1029, invoice says, "Shipped to Montebello Truck Stop," Montebello is far away from Mojave.

We been arguing from the first audit, you know, when I was trying to -- when we lost money and the person filed chapter 7 on us and made a mistake never going to do that again if I stay in business. I'm too old right now to start a new business, I've wasted 20 years on this

thing. And --

2.4

If you look at page 361, they knew the credit owes to us, but they've been holding it back and telling the other auditor he's entitled to \$30,040.52, but hold on because we have another issue, issue number two. So this guy definitely was biased, definitely didn't like us, everything to him was personal, I don't know why.

Where we are, the very simplest thing is one of the -- a very simple thing, is one of the -- if you want to see what price per gallon is, if I buy, pay \$20 for the gas and I get just seven gallons, the most commonsense, easiest way to divide \$20 by seven dollars gallon. I said, "Well, they charge me 3.95 for gas."

And one of his, Mr. Dital's audit, page 1126, he's making an average weekly selling prices, I give him the shift papers -- let me get there. He says on his report for 1/3/2010, my cost was \$2.58 -- six, something like that and I was \$2.30 point nine, right?

Now, if you look at page 1119, that report from the POS system for January 10, '10, if you divide the dollar amount by the gallon, forget the cash sale, discount sale, any discount, or any extra, just add the dollar amount by gallons, it was sold for \$3.07 point nine.

I don't -- I still, to this day, I can't figure

out how he came up that I was selling for \$2.30. Then you're telling me I was selling -- I don't know, like a \$0.27 cents below my cost, when clearly, you can see on the point of sale, generally, day-by-day electronic cash assistance, the selling price was \$3.07.

Same thing since he was doing it weekly, for month of June 22, 2010. He said I was selling my customers 2.44 and I was selling 2.20 -- something, that I was 2.1 cent below my cost, my sale was. My actual sale was \$2.79 point nine, not 2.45 the way he calculated it.

I still couldn't figure out how he came up with that amount, that my cost was 2.60, I was selling 2.40. My POS system says -- page 1128 on 6/21/10, sales was \$2.79 he's saying I was selling it for 2.45. So he keep manipulating, adding this tax to this one, deducted from that one, or saying California State Excise Tax is sales tax actually, it's not sales taxable.

When you're doing your sales tax report, you take sales tax, include you sales out, you take the \$0.18 a gallon, at that time, as I remember, follow the state excise tax out -- the tax by the state law itself. Then you multiply that amount to the tax rate and so that's how much is the sales tax due on the sale, was included in the sale, and they deduct at the amount you paid as a prepayment for the sales tax. And if you have any

balance, you pay it.

2.4

Once the prepayment, I was looking at the paper, I prepaid prepayment sales tax on the sale is almost a million dollars or better a year for taxes upfront. How -- why would I want to short the state for a thousand dollars or five thousand dollars -- ten thousand dollars? It's all black and white.

When I am looking at paperwork and it's kind of, like, make me feel bad because like, I looking at what they have report from audit credit card issuer -- how much the gross credit card clearing house -- is like transportation companies, everything, how much on the annual report how much they paid me, how much gross, how much they took and how much they gave me.

But then we offered the same thing to look at it individually because when you purchase on the credit card when you buy gasoline put your card in the cart -- in the cartridge there, your invoice tell you how much per gallon, how many gallons you bought, how much money you paid, but they're not interested in that one, they keep sticking with national average.

And national average is one of the most inaccurate figure you can use because of outliers, like the locations are different, some gas stations sells 5.79, Arco down the street, five miles away says 3.99. You

cannot use the outlier because -- I even provided to the -- I provide all the audit the reports and everything to the board, was disputing the national average pricing.

Even in Bakersfield, my local area, we're looking at the gas board where they posted fuel prices, the average \$3.39, but the lowest is 2.49, highest was \$9.90. So they make an average almost \$1.50 gallon difference than the guy actually selling \$2.49.

So I went and gave it to the auditor, I said, "I feel sorry for this guy if you want to audit him. He's going to lose his house, his family too." Actually, it's right here, look at it.

Then if I didn't charge enough, it's my fault. If I sell \$1.50 or 2.50 we are talking about the tax rate, based on that, you got all your taxes. Based on what I sold, I know right now the gas station or truck stop will they're working in like 50, 60, 70, cents a gallon markup, some gas stations make a dollar gallon right now. But in my day, if you're making \$0.02 a gallon, you're doing good.

Everybody saying, you know, like you make it in the garage, you make it in the store, the mini market, everything else, gas is just bringing the customers in.

Now these days it is different, after all these years they started actually making money. They're making 50, 60

cents a gallon.

But on it whatever it is, I didn't see all -- all day to print those, they are printed by the POS system automatically, the people at the pump buying it, and all the reports are electronically-generated for credit card receipts per sale or clearing houses. When they pay me, they bring me price per gallon purchase for cash discount if you pay some of them, get to buy in a load to share.

It is all present if you look at it, but they show no interest and they just want to see what the gross was, if it matches the national average pricing profit markup. And five different people, they working for tax supervisor audit the paper, if you look at they came back with the five different results. Now, two of them are the same, one of them in Bakersfield, and I think it was Ventura, she came up when I'm selling \$1.58 below my cost. How could that possibly happen? I wouldn't be lasting business for a week.

Mr. Dital, at least he comes up like about \$0.02 difference, \$0.21 difference. And when you look at it, that is because taking an \$0.18 for the excise tax -- the state excise tax, I have add \$0.02 to it so that's \$0.20 right there, plus what the sales tax add to it.

I don't know how she came up with \$1.20 below my cost, almost make the original audit by Mr. Consigli, the

best audit we had the first one.

I don't know. You know, 2012 we offered the auditors state, bank statements, showed deleted cash, and all the credit card deposit, then you think, kind of like you had it, we didn't know you have it, the way he was acting. It shows deposit in the bank, income tax return we file is right there.

And then after 20 years -- 12 years, the state coming up Exhibit S as an income tax but, the income tax, if you look at it, it was filed by Mr. Hoffman, the income tax filer, the CPA.

2011 was Mr. Hoffman, 2012 I think, Mr. Avari (phonetic), they both same office, he's working for the CPA, Mr. Hoffman. Actually, he was the one who filed that income tax, he was the one offering that the auditor please come look at the paper documents we have and how can you do the audit by looking at just 12 Mondays, and he refused to look at it.

Now they are coming back after 10, 12 years, they say, "Oh, we got him. We have Exhibit S income tax shows that he sold \$8,000,000. Do you have a backup to show where the sale was coming from?" Like 2012 is not part of the audit because the audit ends June of 2012.

But if you look at it, June 2012 says \$8,000,000. But look at the page, the \$547,000 of it was sales of

equipment that we got off our business. We sold the equipment to pay the loans. Even -- then add it to the income tax added to gross sales.

2.4

I don't know. It's your decision, Judge. You can look at the papers all over again, you know. At this time I really cannot afford to hire an attorney or a pay a another bookkeeper, another \$50-\$60,000 expenses to get the same result. Because they are in the driver's seat.

They say you're guilty, you're guilty. But on the other hand, they won't allow you to prove you are not guilty. They want to do the data for you too. If you say I owe you like \$500,000 underreported tax, let me bring my paper and show you that I did not.

They wouldn't even allow me to defend myself.

You go yourself, get the invoices, get the information,

and say, "Oh, national average and some papers. Yeah, you

are guilty." So they are actually like doing the

plaintiff and the defendant at the same time.

So to this day, I cannot defend myself, I cannot prove that I am guilty. They actually say there is some kind of excuse to send back the \$500,000. And every time they audit, they come back with a different number. If you show me two audit that comes up same, that is okay.

JUDGE KWEE: I'm sorry. Did that conclude your --

MR. NAZARI: Yeah. I'm done. I'm done.

JUDGE KWEE: I did want to get clarification. You had pointed to a couple invoices such as the page 1030, 1029 with the ship to address for the truck stops in -- I believe it was Bloomington and Montebello. I wasn't fully understanding. Were you saying you didn't make the -- is that an allegation of --

MR. NAZARI: My opinion is there is more invoices, okay? There is more invoices because our shipping address. Do you see what I'm talking about? You cannot pick and choose which one you want to use to make the guy guilty.

JUDGE KWEE: Right. So were you saying that is not your address?

MR. NAZARI: No, my store was not in Bloomington, it's not Colton. Colton is by Los Angeles, we are in the desert. So if you -- what I'm trying to say, if you're doing the audit and saying I'm an underreported sale, at least let me show you my side to prove to you that I did not.

Instead of that, you cannot pick and choose and say, "Okay. I am going to use that one. I don't need to prove no more. I got you." You see? Or I owe so much money. When I am looking at it I see everything is wrong and every paper because I'm the one did it, but if I'm trying to tell him, "Hey. This is -- that's how he was.

1 You can't use this paper, this is the actual one." 2 They're not interested. We have been through 3 three differed audits, four different hearings, they said 4 they told the state to do the audit. I get in my car, drive to Bakersfield in the middle of summer in the heat, 5 boxes, sweating, carrying the boxes. They are not 6 7 interested. JUDGE KWEE: Okay. So for those particular invoices 8 are you saying that it is not relevant because it is a 9 10 different location and they are looking at incorrect --MR. NAZARI: Yeah, they could be wholesale, they could 11 12 be sold to somebody else, they were not shipped for 13 retail. 14 JUDGE KWEE: Okay. But it was charged to Doomid, 15 Inc., so was there any question that someone else was 16 using your account to make those purchases. 17 MR. NAZARI: No -- no. I am not talking about 18 somebody else using my account. 19 JUDGE KWEE: Okay. 20 I can buy a million gallons of fuel, MR. NAZARI: 21 okay? And give it to somebody else retail it. 22 JUDGE KWEE: Okay. So --23 MR. NAZARI: You follow what I'm saying? 2.4 JUDGE KWEE: Yes. 25 MR. NAZARI: We are selling it at Colton they are

passing it on. Because when you doing business with the refineries, okay? The refineries -- you have those invoices have what they call you have spot buy, you got rack price, then you got discount off of that one. If you pulled 200,000 gallons then you come back all the invoices they give you credit back, like \$0.11, \$0.15, \$0.16 a gallon. T.

2.4

Hat's why, you know, the prices are different, even though the wholesale of the job is they are doing business. For example, we assuming, make a case of it you are Chevron, or you are Arco, I get an offer from you if you pull 20 loads, 20 times 8, \$7,500, that would be like what? 300,000 gallons. By Friday, you get \$0.21 off.

But every road I pull, I get the right price, transportation or the same. So it's just like -- how it works it is just like they are on the promotion. Let's say you can buy this laptop \$1,000, zero interest period for 12 months, but if you don't pay your 12 months we charge you interest from the day one. That is how it works.

So you pull 300,000 gallons by Friday, Saturday morning if you have 295,000 they are all going to go back to rack price. So sometimes you give it to another retailer at the cost to save the discount. You follow what I am doing?

JUDGE KWEE: Right.

MR. NAZARI: Because I don't -- you know, like changing money. Like you said, another independent truck stop, another independency, everybody markets like buying from the other wholesalers still like \$1.95 a gallon, plus taxes.

You say, "I have fuel left, I can give it to you for \$1.78. Go pull it." So that is what I am talking about. So you cannot be pick and chose so if you have those papers, let me bring all the documents to you, share in front of you, then do the real audit.

If you think -- I always assumed that there's something -- I think your paperwork is not right. The state should work with the people and say, "Okay. Let me see what you did. If you did it wrong. Oh, this. You messed up here. Now, see you owe \$10.00." But they never allow you to do that, they never allow you to show them the true paper to prove the history of it. This is the dollar this, is the \$50, this is the paperwork. That's what happen.

If you look at what the requirement it's the 112, one-day old, we got the paper form the distributor or we got the invoices from the oil company, but that's not accurate prices. We could pay accurate prices. It maybe was wholesale, these are documents in it, go look at the

income tax return, let the CPA who filed the income tax, let them put the paper in front of you.

2.4

They refused to meet anybody. And anybody we hired I have it as a witness if we end up litigated in the real -- in the court, I have witnesses, they can come up say what the auditor told them. They come to me, well, this guy really, really, really hates your guts.

JUDGE KWEE: So I see now. Those were to take care of -- take advantage of add a rack or promotional allowances so the wholesale transactions to other retailers --

MR. NAZARI: Yeah, it was passed down period because see, it's kind of like I'm doing the other guy a favor by saving him like about \$0.15, \$0.18 a gallon. He's happy, jumping up and down, you are my friend, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you. But he doesn't know he's saving me about \$4,000, \$5,000 this week if he doesn't pull it. It works both ways, you know, help everybody.

JUDGE KWEE: So my next question then is because that would have impacted -- it seems like that would have impacted the your SG account, but this --

MR. NAZARI: No, it's a set money.

JUDGE KWEE: Right. But this is a wholesale transaction, so it would --

MR. NAZARI: It would not make difference. SG is the same amount of money, it's not a percentage.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. So I guess my question though is how do these invoices impact the audit --

MR. NAZARI: There are other invoices that they don't look at it. That is how they came up, they said I overstated by SG report by \$10,000 because they don't want to look at the papers. Did you look at the audit? It says they adjusted my SG report by almost \$12,000 'cause I overstated my SG report.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. So but the audit before us is the retail account not the --

MR. NAZARI: Right.

JUDGE KWEE: -- so I guess my question is I guess I wasn't sure --

MR. NAZARI: -- but the thing is -- okay. They adjusted my retail, they said my SG are overstated by \$12,000 because they didn't look at the actual papers. They just estimated, they're going by what they want to see.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay.

MR. NAZARI: If they would just see the actual paper, meet with the CPA, then I would ask them you know, when they file I bring them all the papers.

Okay. I get a monthly bank statement and I have a month to sell, it's just like this, I give it to CPA and he's separating them with his machine at about 50

different number for -- accounts, different accounts. And I pay him every month and he does the income tax at the end of the year. Let's see what he has.

They refused to meet the guy, they refused. None of them even wanted to see the papers. We are going around, around, around, around, the hearing, hearing, four hearings. How many people are got to tell me audit, look at the papers.

Instead of 12 years, they just need to spend 6 hours. If they would spend 6, 8 hours, meet with the CPA, look at the income tax then, look at all the schedule to the penny, he's the one doing it. If I was made mistake, I was come back short in doing something wrong, I would know it then, but then I wouldn't be here.

If I owe them a hundred thousand, five hundred thousand I would make a payment, I would make a settlement, go away, over. You know, my life, my time were poured in this, it's aggravating me for 20 years.

Since 2003, I got in the wrong business to have to deal with a State Board of Equalization. Because if they would said instead for 10 years we're going around back and forth, court, court, court, hearing, if they would just spend eight hours, they would know where the problem is then.

And if you look at the papers today, it's still

estimating. They are still guessing. We got the income tax, 2012. Okay. What that prove? Look at my escrow paper, I sold the property, shows in the contract on September of 2012.

But still I was collecting rent of a little shop we had the -- it was road service business and all this thing -- one of the contingencies was the buyer want to buy property, we had to do an environmental report to make sure it's clean. Because we couldn't sell the business if we couldn't get the clearance, so we just sold the equipment.

And the property we sold, the contingency was it was going to run a business for three months to make sure he can make enough money to make a payment because of the Mojave condition, they put a new 58 bypass the city. And so actually, I wasn't even in control of the truck stop for three months.

But yes, I received money for that three months. I was during operation, controlling the business, they couldn't keep the profit, they had to give me rent. They said, "Okay. You run the business, but I've got so much a month for three months while you operating," so everything you can trace it, you can document it. You sit right there, look at it. You can't just say we expect you sell that much and we expect so much percentage marked off.

Like one other thing I was looking at is it started in 2005, they're coming up saying the shop if you say 50 percent -- \$50 what is it? Parts. We assume the labor was \$50, fifty-fifty. I mean, that's another thing far away from the truth.

I just did a tune up on my pickup truck. The spark plugs were \$6 -- \$36, labor was \$950 because they have to take half the engine apart to get this spark plugs to cover that dealer for two days for changing spark plugs. You can sell a \$36 part to get \$36 labor, that's the way they do the audit. I'm not gonna look at the documents.

I don't know. If we're going to end up take our papers to litigation, believe me, I already lost everything I have, why stop post the bond and go to court.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you.

I will turn it over to -- well first, CDTFA because got to check, CDTFA, did you have any questions as far as that testimony portion?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: No, Judge.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Then I will turn it over to my co-panelist to see if they have any questions.

Judge Aldrich, did you have any questions for the taxpayer?

JUDGE ALDRICH: Good morning. I did have a few

questions for you. So you had referenced a few of the invoices that Judge Kwee referred to. There was one from Chevron that said the Colton location, et cetera, and your argument was that you were incentivize to buy large volumes and for buying those large volumes you received a reduction in the per gallon price, is that correct?

MR. NAZARI: Yes. I -- I think they were short. They never shared anything with the taxpayer. In the last 10 years, they did not share anything until I get it in the mail or what they're doing. Because I know that there is more invoices but, why don't you put them all out, don't be picking, choosing.

JUDGE ALDRICH: So my question is, your assertion is that you're getting -- you would get a discount of the per gallon price.

MR. NAZARI: Right.

JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. In evidence, so in the exhibit binder, will I find any document that shows what that per gallon price discount was?

MR. NAZARI: They never -- they were not interested. That's why if you look at it, that's what I was showing page 171. The CPA that has all the documents in his office, he didn't ask how do you want to figure out the whole thing by 12 days, they have the papers. I set the appointment for audit, setting a date for his office, the

e-mail is up here the answer is, "Well, I don't think I need to see any documents."

JUDGE ALDRICH: Do you understand -- so do you understand that part of this process allowed you to submit documents into evidence?

MR. NAZARI: No.

JUDGE ALDRICH: So you were --

MR. NAZARI: The way I'm looking at it -- apologize, just being honest how I feel, okay? This is state, okay? And a state hearing and administrative judges is a part of the state. That's the way my impression is.

For 12 years or better experience I took every single document to the auditor, to Bakersfield, to Fresno, and everything else then nobody interested to do anything, nobody to look at it, I even got in an argument with them telling me, "You're being picky and choosy, you're leaving the \$10 one out. You are picking up the \$12.50, adding it to this one." When I listen to an explanation or something --

JUDGE ALDRICH: So an example of those invoices that were from the provider is do you have the documents, the other invoices?

MR. NAZARI: Well, there are 30 invoices, okay? They are not the invoices, they are estimate. If those don't watch, you're being charged so much, rebate you so much.

2.4

JUDGE ALDRICH: So you are saying the documents you were referring to from Chevron are estimates or --

MR. NAZARI: Yeah. Everything -- everything I showed them is lie. They have the wrong, they have the wrong paperwork. Everything showed to the state -- to the auditor is lie, it is not -- I just want this, I just want that, that is it.

JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay.

MR. NAZARI: I mean, it got to the point they start to accost you, call you names, making racist remarks and everything else, how else are you gonna deal with these people like that?

JUDGE ALDRICH: Yeah. So just as a point of clarification, I believe it's already been indicated and has probably addressed in the prehearing conference, but we are a separate and independent agency from CDTFA, just so that's clear.

At this time I'm going to refer over to Judge Kwee.

JUDGE KWEE: Yes. Thank you. I'm gonna turn it over then to Judge Ridenour.

Judge Ridenour do you have any questions for the witness?

JUDGE RIDENOUR: Yes. Actually, it's just a piggyback on Judge Aldrich's question. So just to confirm, these

boxes that you gave to the CPA that you say substantiate your cost, you have not provided them to the OTA?

2.4

MR. NAZARI: No, it was -- that's why I was saying area page 239, page 1110, all the communications -- e-mail communications that we asking the auditor to come and audit, set the date, you come to the office, look at it.

And he was agree -- he agreed to do it, he set the date, and he went even in there so we can start, we're looking at the shift paper, we can look at your -- what is it? Daily shift, your purchases, and everything.

So what we do, we make sure everything is out there, we contacted Pepsi, I remember. I personally went to Frito Lay distributor sat there for -- I don't know, about an hour. They had to print out all the sales to that location.

JUDGE RIDENOUR: Right. Actually, my question is all those documents you're referring though, you have not submitted to OTA. That was ultimately my question.

MR. NAZARI: The State Board got it, but the OTA, no. JUDGE RIDENOUR: Not the OTA? Okay. Thank you.

No more questions.

MR. NAZARI: You know, we submitted it for the audit as a part of audit requirement, but he changed his mind to look at it.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. This is Judge Kwee. Just I guess

a clarification then, do you still have those documents?

MR. NAZARI: More or less, yes. We can find it.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay.

MR. NAZARI: I can look for it.

JUDGE KWEE: And my next question before I turn it over to CDTFA, during CDTFA's presentation could you all address whether or not a review of the source documents would help or potentially change any of the adjustments warranted by CDTFA during their re-audit?

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: We will.

MR. NAZARI: May I? If you look through the exhibit, actually, I contacted the suppliers to get the invoices. It was my idea, my suggestion to Mr. Dital because I went to get my purchase invoices and it was in storage, sitting in storage for five years, six years. When I went to the storage, they were invested with bugs and rats and very smelly really bad, so I took a picture of them, and I took it to the auditor in Bakersfield.

I said, "Portion of boxes is like this. I can bring with me or we can get a fresh one, copy from the suppliers." So instead of discuss it further, he called the suppliers and it's in his report even though the document shows clearly invoices from Chevron, you know, same thing. And he said that the taxpayer said that the documents were destroyed.

1	They've never been destroyed, I had it, but it's
2	infested with bugs and spider webs and rats got into it
3	somehow, it smells, it's unbearable. You want to look at
4	those? Okay. We can get a copy from the original
5	matchbooks.
6	It's one of the things responded to if I ever
7	represent it him, give it to the auditor, I even took it
8	to Bakersfield. If you look at his report, it says,
9	"Taxpayer said that the documents not available, they are
10	destroyed." Even the pictures in his own file shows it's
11	not destroyed.
12	JUDGE KWEE: Okay. I think I understand the issue and
13	aside yeah, with the documents. Thank you. If the
14	panel's ready to turn over to CDTFA. Questions?
15	Judge Aldrich, do you have any further questions?
16	JUDGE ALDRICH: No. Thank you.
17	JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Judge Ridenour, do you have any
18	further questions before we proceed?
19	JUDGE RIDENOUR: No. Thank you.
20	JUDGE KWEE: Then I will turn it over to CDTFA.
21	CDTFA, I believe you had requested a combined
22	opening and closing for 35 minutes, so I will turn it over
23	to you now. The floor is yours. Thanks.

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Thank you, Judge.

PRESENTATION

24

25

Appellant is a California corporation that operated a truck stop with a minimart in Mojave, California. Appellant made both retail and wholesale sale of diesel fuel. Appellate did not sell gasoline, the minimart sold miscellaneous taxable and nontaxable items.

2.4

Appellant commenced business on July 1st, 2003 and seized operation on December 31st, 2012 with no known successor.

The Department audited Appellant's business for the period of January 1st, 2009 through June 30th, 2012. During the audit period, Appellant reported around \$20,000,000 as total sales and claimed various types of deductions, resulting in reported taxable sales of around \$16,000,000, and that will be on your exhibit A pages 20 and 21.

In addition, Appellant claimed around 1.3 million dollars in prepaid sales tax on purchases of diesel fuel, and that will be on your Exhibit C page 103.

During our presentation, we will explain why the Department rejected Appellant's reported and recorded taxable sales. Why the Department used an indirect audit approach. How the Department determined Appellant's unreported sales tax for the audit period. And why the Department recommended a 10 percent negligence penalty.

Appellant stated its sales and use tax returns

were prepared using sales summary worksheets compiled from his POS systems daily sales reports but, during the audit Appellant failed to provide complete sales records.

2.4

Appellate did not provide complete sales documents of original entry such as, POS sales information with all folders for the audit period, nor did Appellant provide complete sales report or sales journals. In addition, Appellant failed to provide complete purchase journals or other information about its diesel and merchandise purchases.

Due to lack of reliable records and negative reported and recorded full markups, the Department did not accept reported and recorded taxable sales.

The Department also determined that Appellant's record was such that taxable sales could not be verified by a direct audit approach. Therefore, the Department used an indirect audit approach to estimate Appellant's taxable sale of fuel and minimart items.

The Department completed four verification methods to verify the reasonableness of Appellant's reported taxable sales. First, since Appellant did not provide its federal income tax returns, the Department requested and received appellants 2011 and 2012 Federal Income Tax Returns from the Franchise Tax Board, and that will be on your Exhibit S.

Comparing the federal income tax return gross receipt for those two years with Appellant's reported total sale of around 12.1 million dollars for the same period showed an overall difference of around 4.6 million dollars, and that will be on your Exhibit S, page 1148.

The Department also compared reported total sale of around 12.1 million dollars to the cost of goods sold of around 15.4 million dollars reflected on Appellant's available federal income tax returns and calculated in overall negative reported book markup of around 22 percent, and that will be on your Exhibit S, page 1149.

Based on the negative reported book markup,

Appellant would have been losing money every time he made
a sale. However, based on audited sales and cost of goods
sold reflected on Appellant's 2011 Federal Income Tax

Return, the Appellant's post markup was a little less than
5 percent, and that will be on your Exhibit S, page 1150.

Second, as a retail of diesel fuel, Appellant was required to prepay a portion of the sales tax on each gallon of fuel purchased. Then Appellant was required to report and claim the prepaid sales tax on a Schedule G.

In addition, as a wholesale of diesel fuel,
Appellant was required to collect a prepaid portion of the
sales tax from other wholesalers, suppliers, or retailers
who purchased fuel from Appellant. Then Appellant was

required to report and remit the paid sales tax if collected using a prepayment of sales tax on fuel sales return, which is commonly referred to as an ASG return.

The ASG return has a Schedule A for reporting the quantity of fuel sold to retailers and it has a Schedule B for reporting the quantity of fuel it purchased and the amount of prepaid sales tax paid to its suppliers. Based on this information, the Department compared Appellant-claimed prepaid sales tax on diesel fuel with a prepaid sales tax that Appellant diesel vendors reported to have collected from Appellant and calculated difference of around \$11,000, that will be on your Exhibit C, page 103.

Third, the Department compared the claim prepaid sales tax of around 1.3 million dollars with applicable diesel prepayment tax rate per gallon and determined Appellant purchased around 7.5 million gallons of diesel fuel during the audit period, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 28.

The Department compared the reported taxable sales for the audit period of around \$16,000,000 with the total number of gallons to estimate an oral quarterly diesel selling price per gallon of \$2.19, ranging from as low as \$1.72, to as high as \$2.87, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 32.

This computed average diesel prices also include the Appellant's minimart taxes full sales because Appellant did not provide any sales information to support Appellant's reported taxable mini mart sales for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 32.

2.4

Therefore, the Department was not able to exclude the minimart taxable sales from Appellant's reported taxable sales to calculate Appellant's reported diesel sales for the audit period.

From the fuel observations, the auditor net tax price per gallon range from as low as \$1.85, to as high as \$3.76 for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit C, page 86.

Fourth, Appellant did not provide complete purchase invoices for the audit period. Therefore, the Department opted available purchase information from appellants fuel vendors, and that will be on your Exhibit N through Exhibit P.

The Department uses available fuel purchase information to determine the overall cost of goods sold for the diesel fuel was \$3.09 per gallon, ranging from as low as \$1.71, to as high as \$3.91 for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 36.

These overall reported selling prices and cost prices of diesel fuel were compared to calculate reported

book markup of diesel fuel for the audit period. And that will be on your Exhibit A, page 32.

2.4

The Department noted negative reported book markups for every reported quarter of the audit period, except first quarter 2009, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 32.

If these reported amounts are accurate then Appellant lost money every time it sold a gallon of fuel and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 32.

The Department also calculated the recorded diesel fuel markup using available sales summary worksheets and diesel fuel purchase invoices for the period October 1st, 2010 through December 31st, 2011, and that will be on your Exhibit A, page 41.

The Department also noted negative reported book markups for those five quarters of the audit period, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 41.

Appellant was unable to explain the federal income tax return sales differences, prepaid sales tax differences, low reported average fuel selling prices, and negative reported and recorded diesel fuel markups.

Therefore, the Department conducted further investigation using the US Department of Energy's database list average weekly diesel retail prices and using Appellant's claim prepaid sales tax for the audit period.

The Department of Energy provides independent statistics and analyses of statewide diesel selling prices. It accomplished these activities through the Energy Information Administration, one of the numerous entities within the agency. This administration is responsible for collecting and analyzing energy information, including the average weekly retail prices in California and other regions.

On one day each week, the Department of Energy surveys diesel stations in various areas and determines an average selling price for that week. Appellant did not provide complete sales records, so the Department obtained California's average weekly prices for diesel from the federal database, and that will be on your Exhibit C, pages 93 to 97.

The Department established audited diesel fuel selling prices per gallon using retail prices the Department observed posted at Appellant's business location on Thursday, August 16, 2012; Monday, August 27, 2012; and Monday, September 17, 2012, and that will be on your Exhibit C, page 89.

The Department observed different selling prices for purchases paid by cash and paid by credit card. The Department noted that Appellant's selling prices for purchases paid by credit cards were \$0.08 to \$0.10 more

than the cash retail prices.

For Appellant's benefit, the Department only relied upon the cheaper cash retail prices. The Department compared the cash retail prices to the corresponding average weekly prices, including sales tax reimbursement and state excise tax reimbursement in order to find any price differentials.

The Department determined a Appellant's prices on those observation days was \$0.07 lower than the average weekly prices, published by the Department of Energy, and that will be on your Exhibit C, page 89. Therefore, the price differential was \$0.07.

For each quarterly period in the audit period, the Department of Energy average weekly prices were average to calculate an average quarterly price for diesel fuel, and that will be on Exhibit C, page 88.

Then the Department reduced the average quarterly selling in price differential of by \$0.07 and by the exempt California Excise Tax to determine the auditors selling price of diesel fuel, including sales tax reimbursement, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 28.

The Department divided this figure by applicable sales tax rate factors to determine the audited tax selling price for diesel fuel for each quarter, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 28.

The Department calculated the audited gallon of diesel fuel purchased of around 7.5 million gallons for the audit period by dividing the prepaid sales tax Appellant claimed on sales and use tax return by the applicable prepaid sales tax rate, and that will be on Exhibit A page 28.

The Department also calculated the audited gallons of diesel fuel sold for resale of around 38,000 gallons by dividing the prepaid sales tax on diesel fuel Appellant reported on its SG permit by applicable prepaid sales tax rate for the audit period, and that will be on Exhibit C, page 99.

The diesel fuel gallons that Appellant sold for resale were deducted from the total gallons that Appellant purchased to determine the total gallon of around 7.5 million gallons for available to sell at retail, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 28.

Based on those 7.5 million gallons, and the ex-tax average quarterly diesel selling prices, the Department determined the audited ex-tax diesel sale of around \$22,000,000 for the audit period, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 28.

Appellant did not provide sales and purchase information for his minimart, therefore, the Department relied upon Appellant's claim exempt minimart merchandise

sale of around \$344,000 and that would be on Exhibit C, page 91.

2.4

Based on audit of similar businesses, the

Department expected taxable minimart merchandise sales to

be 59 percent of total minimart sales and exempt minimart

merchandise sales to be 41 percent of total minimart

sales.

The Department calculated a ratio of taxable minimart merchandise sales to accept minimart merchandise sale of around 144 percent, and that will be on Exhibit C, page 91.

The Department applied this ratio to determine audited ex-tax taxable minimarket merchandise sale of around \$496,000 for the audit period, and that will be on Exhibit C, page 91.

The Department recalculated the reported diesel selling price per gallon by adjusting the reported taxable sale of around \$16,000,000 with audited minimart taxable sales of around \$496,000 for the audit period, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 33.

The Department noted an overall reported selling price per gallon of \$2.12, ranging from as low as \$1.65, to as high as \$2.79, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 33.

The Department also recalculated the reported

diesel fuel book markups for the audit period, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 33.

2.4

The Department combined audited diesel sales and audited taxable minimart sales to determine audited taxable sale of around \$22,000,000 for the audit period. And that will be on Exhibit A, page 27.

Audited taxable sales were compared with reported taxable sales of around \$16,000,000 to determine unreported taxable sales of around 5.7 million dollars for the audit period, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 26.

The Department then compared the unreported taxable sales with the reported taxable sale of around \$16,00,000 to calculate the error rate of around 35 percent for the audit period.

In preparation for this hearing, the Department discovered an error in Schedule A, page 30, Appellant's observed sales values and average weekly prices published by the Department of Energy were placed in the wrong columns, making it appear that Appellant's observed selling prices were \$0.07 more than the average weekly prices published by the Department of Energy.

The placement was an error, but the calculation used in the audit correctly subtracted differential and Schedule A, page 28 and the liability figures are correct.

The Department performed a markup analysis to

verify the reasonableness of audited taxable sales. The Department compared the audited sales with a cost of goods so reflected on a Appellant's 2011 Federal Income Tax Return to calculate the audited markup of around 5 percent, and that will be on Exhibit S, page 1150.

2.4

The Department determined that the audited taxable sale markup of around 5 percent was reasonable and that the audited taxable sales were likewise reasonable.

Had the Department used the reported sales reflected on Appellant's 2011 Federal Income Tax Return then the unreported taxable sales would have increased by around 2.6 million dollars for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit S, page 1151.

Therefore, the Department finds that the estimated amount as is in this audit is not only reasonable, but benefits the Appellant.

The audit calculation of unreported taxable sales based on the best available information was reasonable and was in Appellant's favor since it was the lowest of the differences determined.

When the Department is not satisfied with the accuracy of the tax return file, it may rely upon any facts contained in those returns or upon any information that comes into the Department's position to determine if any tax liability exists.

A taxpayer shall maintain and make available for examination on request by the Department all records necessary to determine the correct tax liability under the Sales and Use Tax Law and all records necessary for the proper completion of the sales and use tax return.

2.4

When a taxpayer challenges an Notice of
Determination, the Department has a burden to explain the
basis for that deficiency. When the Department
explanation appears reasonable, the burden of proof shifts
to the taxpayer to explain why the Department asserted
deficiencies not valued.

Appellate contends that Department has not conducted an audit of his books and records and the liability is based on estimates and arbitrary averages that resulted in inflating the Department's expected taxable sales.

However, Appellant now contends that the Department issued a supplemental deficient which reduced the taxable measure by 1.6 million dollars from 5.6 million dollars to around \$4,000,000, and that will be on your Exhibit B, pages 54 through 56, and Exhibit H.

Appellant indicated that it would like to accept the liability as determined in the first re-audit, but the Department was no longer willing to accept this amount.

Appellant asserts that it provided the

documentation that was required to support his taxable sales for the audit period, and that will be on your Exhibit G, Exhibit M, and Exhibit Q. As support, Appellant provided various sales and use tax returns, second quarter 2011, sales summary worksheets, some daily sales reconciliation reports, some clearing house statement transmission from T-Chek, and some fuel purchase invoices from Ramos and Strong, Inc., five total stacks of documents, data for 2007 and 2009, crude oil prices from an unspecified source, diesel fuel prices for December 1st, 2015 published on the website of California Gas Buddy, and other additional documents, and that will be on Exhibit G, Exhibit N, and Exhibit O.

The Department analyzed these arguments and ultimately rejected them and that will be on Exhibit J and Exhibit r.

As mentioned earlier, the Department determined the cost per gallon using purchase invoices provided by Appellant's vendors, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 36.

Using these cost prices and the selling prices determined in the first re-audit per supplemental decision negative markups for the audit period in the cost per gallon exceeded the selling prices determined in the first re-audit, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 34, Exhibit

B, page 59, Exhibit J and Exhibit S, page 1150.

2.4

The Department also compared the quarterly cost per gallon to the audited selling price per gallon determined in the second re-audit which disclosed a markup of less than 5 percent for 6 out of 14 quarters, and that will be on Exhibit A, page 34.

It is likely that the low markups occurred because the Department used Appellant's low cash selling prices without making an adjustment for higher credit card selling prices when determining the price differential of \$0.07, and that will be on Exhibit C, page 89.

Therefore, the Department determined it is unreasonable for Appellant to sell its diesel fuel at a price that is below the cost of diesel fuel and rejected Appellant's argument.

Finally, the Department imposed a negligence penalty based upon its determination that Appellant books and records were incomplete and inaccurate for sales and use tax purposes and because Appellant failed to accurately report its taxable sales. Appellant was previously audited, in the prior audit, the Department concluded that Appellant's books and records were incomplete and inadequate for sales and use tax purposes.

For this audit period, Appellant did not provide complete source documents, such as the POS sales data with

all folders, POS sales reports, complete POS daily reports to support its reported sales on its sales and use tax returns.

2.4

Appellant also did not provide its diesel fuel and merchandise purchase invoices for the audit period. The Department finds that the Appellant's failure to provide its complete books and records is evidence of negligence. As a result, the Department had to determine Appellant's taxable sales based upon an analysis of California average weekly prices published by the Department of Energy and Appellant's claim prepaid sales tax for the audit period.

In addition, the audit examination disclosed on reported taxable sales of around 5.7 million dollars, which when compared with a reported taxable sale of around \$16,000,000 for the audit period resulted in an error rate of 35 percent. This error rate is higher than the error rate found in the prior audit, which is further evidence of negligence.

In conclusion, when Appellant did not provide complete source documentation, the Department was unable to verify the accuracy of reported sales taxes using a direct audit method. Therefore, an alternate audit method was used to determine unreported sales tax.

Accordingly, the Department determined the

unreported sales tax based upon the best available information. The evidence shows that the audit produced fair and reasonable results.

2.4

The audit calculation of diesel fuel based on Appellant's low cash selling crisis was not only reasonable, but benefited the Appellant 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.

Appellant has not provided any reasonable documentation or evidence to support an adjustment to the audit finding. Therefore, the Department requests the appeal be denied.

This concludes our presentation. We are available to answer any questions the panel may have. Thank you.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you. I will start with Judge Aldrich.

Did you have any questions for CDTFA?

JUDGE ALDRICH: No questions. Thank you.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Judge Ridenour, did you have any questions for CDTFA?

JUDGE RIDENOUR: No questions. Thank you.

JUDGE KWEE: I'm just going to follow up on the discussion that we had about the add rack allowances that

they got for, I guess the volume discounts that they got for -- in exchange for making purchases delivered to other retailers to increase their volume purchases. Is that something CDTFA considered? Would that have that impacted on the audit on any way? I think they have referenced invoices on page 1026 and 1027, I believe.

2.4

MR. SAMARAWICKREMA: Judge, you already -- you already questioned that. You know, it's shipped it to a different location relative to the taxpayer, but our objective here of using the purchase information just to identify the cost per gallon.

And the Department used the taxpayer's claim prepayment to use a number of gallons that they purchased during the audit period and used the average -- the selling prices after giving adjustment of the cash selling prices.

So it doesn't make a difference because we base -- the Department basically used the claimed prepayment.

MR. PARKER: Judge Kwee, I just want to add the claim prepayment on the Schedule G, as part of the gas sellers return, is the prepayment for the gallons sold at retail. So the amount that the taxpayer claim were gallons sold at retail and claimed the credit for are the gallons that we use to calculate the audit liability.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Great. Thank you.

I guess I will turn it over to Mr. Nazari, did -you have five minutes for any closing remarks you wish to
make.

CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. NAZARI: Thank you, sir.

We heard the state has we discussed before, taxpayer never provided books and records. That's the problem we have from the beginning.

If you look at the page 904, that's a sample.

Okay. 904 through 912 and 865 is complete study, even the cashier handling the record of what he sells, electronic property, and detail of sale of the store, the merchandise sold from a pack of gum and a bottle of Pepsi, to what they sell what's a credit card, or cash or what it was.

Everyday for five years it's available it was in the boxes, they refused to look at it. They were summarized weekly, monthly, quarterly, and yearly.

Because to pay the quarterly taxes, they had to summarize all those papers, they have to pay income tax, they have to summarize it annually. They never looked at it, per the e-mails that we discussed, but always the taxpayer never provided complete books and never had the books.

Then if we're looking at the first when disagreed with the auditors when he observed the selling prices at

three different days, the state just talked about it, the reason I knew it was a wrong statement because the truck stop from day one, even today as we are still right here. Cash different, cash price and sell price is \$0.06 a gallon, always been \$0.06 a gallon.

2.4

And if you want to get the evidence before we all get the cell phone, every state agent had his camera in the trunk, he didn't have no single picture of the price sign, it's visually sitting big 24 by 24 feet, sitting by the highway. No single camera. If you want evidence the audit manual sell says you go by a dollar with the gasoline and then dispose of the gasoline per requirement — blah, blah, blah — to show that you have an invoice, you bought the gas.

He has no purchase, no evidence, no photos, and then what I did, if you go to page 562 to challenge that idea that he was visit the place, I included further copies -- Google Earth of the truck stop. Even you can see the prices in the Google photos when you look at actual.

And there is a brochure flyer for selling of the truck stop, some of it has a date on it, even shows the date what the price was on it, then the difference was \$0.06 or something.

And he said that state rejected the Gas Buddy.

If you look at the SDNR, the footnotes, the Gas Buddy is very verifiable and verified by the state, the auditor, if you read it under SDR footnotes report, he estimated as accurate. That is why he recommends to reduce \$0.30 of the prices.

Then, I mean, I thank him for reading the report because he has no knowledge of the report. He actually had never done it, he just reads whatever the paper says. He shows the auditor did this, and shows the auditor said he has no books and records, but actually I'm the one went through the process one-by-one and there is evidence.

The books and records was available, they refused to look at it, they said that actually observe the area in three different days and the price was \$0.10 difference cash price than actually any person, second grade elementary, can see the numbers 6 is different \$1.03, \$1.09 is \$0.06 difference. That wouldn't be eight to ten cents estimating. It's a benefit I give the taxpayer cash prices.

Everything is right here is and it's the audit and this report is biased. That is why the people kept saying this guy hates your guts and didn't want to take my case. The page 562 shows the flyer -- you look at you can see the store, the complete store is about 100 square feet with a total inventory at any given time within the total

inventory in the store wouldn't be \$300, \$500, mostly would be drinks in the refrigerator.

And they're saying like that a source of \$3,000,000. I mean, that's supply is showing it as big as possible to make -- expand the picture to make attractive to the buyer.

If you look at the page 643 -- yeah, 643 and 645 -- 44 this the store. This is the estimated sell over three and a half million dollars but, they refuse to look at the actual sale, sitting right there, right in front of them shows how many Pepsi they sold, how many cigarettes they sold, how many packs of gun they sold and inventory how many they had and how many added was deducted.

I'm done. Thank you.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you. I believe we are ready to conclude the hearing.

Judge Aldrich, did you have any final questions for either party before we conclude?

JUDGE ALDRICH: No. Thank you.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Judge Ridenour, did you have any final questions for either party before we conclude today?

JUDGE RIDENOUR: No. Thank you.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Then I believe we will submit this case for decision on Thursday, July 13th, 2023. The record -- evidentiary record is now closed.

```
1
              Thank you, everyone, for coming in today.
     judges, the three of us, will meet after today's hearing.
 2
     We will provide a written decision within 100 days of
 3
 4
     today's date. Today's hearing in the Appeal of Doomid,
     Inc. -- the rehearing matter is now concluded.
 5
 6
              (Hearing concluded at 11:50 a.m.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	OF
3	HEARING REPORTER
4	
5	The undersigned hearing reporter does hereby certify:
6	That the foregoing was taken before me at the time and
7	place therein that any witnesses in the foregoing
8	proceedings were duly sworn; that a record was made of the
9	proceedings by me using a machine shorthand, recorded
10	stenographically, which was thereafter transcribed under
11	my direction.
12	
13	I further certify I am neither financially interested
14	in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney
15	or party to this action.
16	
17	Dated July 13, 2023
18	Hanna Jenkin
19	0
20	han I
21	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
22	
23	
24	
25	

Index: \$0.02..2.45

 \$	\$12.50 42:17	\$532 9:25 10:17 11:8,15	1126 25:14
	\$16,00,000 57:13	\$547,000 30:25	1128 26:13
\$0.02 21:14,24 28:19 29:19,22	\$16,000,000 47:14 50:21 56:18	\$6 40:7	1148 49:5
\$0.07 20:4 54:9, 12,18 57:20 61:11	57:8 62:16 \$18,000 15:15	\$64,000 13:25 14:6,25	1149 49:11 1150 49:17 58:5
\$0.08 53:25	\$2.12 56:22	\$7,500 34:12	61:1 1151 58:13
\$0.10 53:25	\$2.19 50:23	\$8,000,000 30:21,	11:50 2:17
\$0.11 34:6	\$2.30 25:18 26:1	24	12 4:10 15:4,6
\$0.15 34:6 36:13	\$2.49 28:8	\$9.90 28:6	17:6,10,14 18:22,
\$0.16 34:6	\$2.58 25:17	\$950 40:7	25 30:8,17,19 34:18 38:9 41:24
\$0.18 26:19 29:21 36:13	\$2.79 26:10,14 56:23	0	42:12 12.1 49:3,7
\$0.20 29:22	\$2.87 50:24	09 17:6	12900 2:15
\$0.21 29:20 34:13	\$20 25:10,12		13 2:17 5:1
\$0.27 26:3	\$20,000 15:15	1	13th 5:8
\$0.83 21:19	\$20,000,000	1 8:19,23 9:1	14 15:5 16:23,25
\$1,000 34:17	47:12	1,146 7:1	61:5
\$1.20 29:24	\$22,000,000 55:21 57:5	1,206 7:7	144 56:10
\$1.50 28:7,14	\$3.07 25:23 26:5	1-4 4:5 9:3	15.4 49:8
\$1.58 29:16	\$3.09 51:21	1.3 47:16 50:15	16 53:19
\$1.65 56:22	\$3.39 28:6	1.6 59:19	17 53:20
\$1.71 51:22	\$3.76 51:12	1/3/2010 25:17	171 19:2 41:22
\$1.72 50:24	\$3.91 51:22	10 15:18 17:6	172 19:2
\$1.78 35:8	\$30,040.52 25:4	25:20 30:19 38:21 41:8 47:24	19054812 2:6 5:8
\$1.85 51:11	\$344,000 56:1	1027 24:8	1:30 18:22
\$1.95 35:5	\$36 40:7,10		1st 47:6,10 52:13
\$10 21:18,19	\$4,000 36:16	1029 24:18 32:2 103 47:18 50:13	60:11
42:17	\$4,000,000 59:20	103 47.18 30.13 1030 24:13 32:2	2
\$10,000 37:5	\$496,000 56:14,	1030 24:13 32:2	•
\$10 21:20	19	1086 18:15	2 8:23
\$10.00 35:16	\$5,000 36:16	11 8:5 17:6	2.1 26:9
\$11 21:20	\$50 35:19 40:3,4	1110 44:4	2.20 26:8
\$11,000 50:12	\$50-\$60,000 31:7	1110 44.4 1119 25:19	2.40 26:12
\$12,000 18:7 37:7,16	\$500,000 14:16, 21 20:11 22:5 31:12,21	1119 25:19 112 35:21	2.44 26:8 2.45 26:10,14

Index: 2.49..accurate

2.49 28:6 2.50 28:14	3	5	8/16/2012 19:23 8/27/12 19:25
2.6 58:12	3 8:23	5 49:17 58:4,7 61:5	82.50 21:19
2.60 26:12	3.95 25:13	5.6 59:19	86 51:13
20 15:18 16:1	3.99 27:25	5.7 57:9 62:14	88 54:16
24:25 30:8 34:12	30 11:22 42:23	5.79 27:24	89 53:21 54:11
38:18 47:14	57:16	50 28:17,25 37:25	61:11
20,000 22:12,13	30,000 22:12	40:3	8th 10:20
200 24:16	30-30-30 22:23	500 23:16	
200,000 34:5	300 2:15 23:16	523 13:16	9
2000 9:25	300,000 34:13,21	54 59:21	9 4:5 15:19,20
2003 13:1 14:24 38:19 47:6	30th 47:10	56 59:21	9/17/2012 19:25
2005 13:3,8 40:2	31st 47:7 52:13	58 39:15	91 56:2,11,15
2006 13:11 14:24	32 50:25 51:5 52:2,6,9	59 56:5 61:1	93 53:15
2007 60:9	33 56:20,24 57:2	6	97 53:15
2009 16:14 47:10 52:5 60:9	34 60:25 61:6		99 55:12
2010 26:7 52:13	342 21:5	6 38:9,10 61:5	9:30 2:16 5:2
	35 12:3 46:22	6/21/10 26:13	9:36 5:9
2011 30:12 48:23 49:15 52:13 58:3,	57:13 62:17	60 28:17,25	Α
10 60:5	36 51:23 60:20	626011 10:18	
2012 10:1,5 15:20	361 25:2	65 4:16	A's 8:20
16:14 17:7 18:17 30:2,12,22,23,24	38,000 55:8	6660 24:7	A-S 4:4 8:1
39:2,4 47:7,10		6666 24:11	a.m. 2:16,17 5:2,9
48:23 53:19,20	4	6th 15:3 18:17	accept 22:14,17,
2015 60:11	4 8:19,24 9:2		19 48:13 56:9 59:22,24
2018 10:20	4.17 20:1		accomplished
2023 2:17 5:1,8	4.33 20:1	7 13:17 14:2 24:23	53:3
21 47:15	4.35 20:1	7.5 50:17 55:2,15,	accost 43:10
22 26:7 49:10	4.6 49:4	18	account 33:16,18
239 18:20 44:4	40 11:20 12:23	70 28:17	36:20 37:10
26 57:10	400 22:5	752 24:10	accountant 13:22,23 18:2,12
27 53:19 57:6	41 52:14,17 56:6	8	accounts 38:1
28 50:19 54:21,25 55:6,17,22 57:24	458 18:18		accuracy 19:4
295,000 34:22	46 4:11	8 4:4 15:3 34:12 38:10	58:22 62:22
			accurate 18:25 35:24 52:7

accurately 7:10 agenda 9:8 appears 59:9 Arco 27:25 34:11 61:20 aggravating Appellant 2:7 3:6 area 28:4 44:4 acting 16:2 30:6 38:18 7:3 8:4 9:18 12:9 areas 53:10 47:1,3,6,11,16,25 activities 53:3 agree 19:20 44:7 arguing 24:21 48:3,6,8,21 49:13, actual 23:4 26:9 agreed 44:7 18,20,23,25 argument 22:23 33:1 37:16,20 50:10,11,17 51:3, 41:4 42:15 61:15 **Aldrich** 3:3 5:15 14 52:8,18 53:11 ad 20:13 40:23,25 41:13,17 55:4,10,13,14,23 arguments 60:14 42:3,7,20 43:1,8, 58:16 59:17,22,25 add 14:14 25:22 **ASG** 50:3.4 13 46:15,16 29:22,23 31:2 60:4 61:13,17,19, 63:18,20 36:9 63:25 20,24 62:4,20 asserted 59:10 Aldrich's 43:25 63:6,9,10 added 15:14 31:3 assertion 41:13 **ALJ** 5:15 appellant's 4:5 adding 26:15 asserts 59:25 8:3 9:3 11:20 42:17 allegation 32:6 47:9,20,22 48:14, assigned 14:23 17,20 49:2,8,15, addition 47:16 allowances 36:9 15:24 16:13 21:2 63:25 16 51:2,4,7,8 48:8 49:22 62:13 assistance 26:5 52:24 53:18,24 additional 7:9,16 allowed 42:4 54:2,8 55:25 assume 40:3 8:9 9:7 21:24 57:16,19 58:3,10, alternate 62:23 60:12 **assumed** 35:12 19 60:19 61:8,15, amount 25:21,23 22 62:6,9,11 63:5 address 24:5 assuming 34:10 26:12,22,24 36:25 32:3,9,13 45:7 Appellant-50:7 58:15 59:24 attorney 6:9 addressed 43:15 claimed 50:9 17:15 31:6 amounts 52:7 appellants 48:23 adjusted 37:7,15 **audit** 10:8,9 12:25 analyses 53:2 51:17 14:8,9,10 15:2,19, adjusting 56:17 analysis 57:25 23,24,25 16:23 Appellate 47:4 adjustment 22:5 62:9 17:1,7,11,16 48:4 59:12 61:9 63:11 18:21 19:4,8,10, analyzed 60:14 applicable 50:15 14,17,24 20:6,14, adjustments 54:22 55:5,10 analyzing 53:6 15,16,20 21:4,6,7 45:8 22:3,5 23:8,12,17 applied 20:9 Andrew 3:25:14 administration 24:21 25:14 27:10 56:12 3:9 53:4,5 Angeles 32:15 28:2,10 29:13,25 applies 20:5 30:1,17,23 31:22, administrative **angry** 18:1 23 32:17 33:4 appointment 5:14 6:21 8:2 9:4 animosity 19:21 35:11 37:2,6,9 18:14,24 19:15 42:10 38:7 40:11 41:25 41:25 **annual** 27:13 **admit** 8:18 44:6,22,23 47:11, appreciated 13:7 apologize 11:14 21,23 48:2,6,16, admitted 7:23 17 50:18,21 51:4, 42:8 approach 47:22 8:16 9:1 14:22 9,12,15,22 52:1,4, 48:16,17 appeal 2:5 5:5,25 admitting 7:4,16 16,25 54:13 55:3, 8:8 9:6,16 10:25 approximately 11,21 56:3,14,19 advantage 36:9 63:13 5:9 57:1,5,10,14,23 afford 31:6 58:12,15,17 59:13 appealed 23:20 **Arab** 17:23 60:2,23 61:21,24 agency 6:4 43:16 **Appeals** 2:1 5:7 **Arabs** 17:23 62:5,12,13,16,18, 53:5 23 63:2,4,8,12 **APPEARANCES** arbitrary 59:14 3:1

Index: audited..cents

audited 47:9 45:17 22 62:7 55:1,7 56:8 49:14 53:16 54:23 Bakersfield 28:4 borrowed 14:4 calculation 57:22 55:1,7,20 56:13, 29:15 33:5 42:13 58:17 63:4 18 57:3,4,7 58:1, bottom 24:5 45:18 46:8 2,4,6,8 61:3,21 California 2:2,16 **bought** 27:19 balance 13:16 3:8 5:1,12 24:5,7, auditing 16:19 27:1 **box** 24:9,15 10,12 26:16 47:1, auditor 14:10,14, 3 53:8 54:19 **bank** 17:3 19:9 boxes 17:8 33:6 23 15:24 16:11, 60:11 62:10 30:3,6 37:23 44:1 45:19 12,13 17:20 18:8, California's 19,23 19:12 20:22 base 20:8 bring 22:9 29:7 53:13 21:2,3 23:21 24:1 31:12 35:10 37:22 based 18:25 25:4 28:9 30:15 call 16:9 34:3 45:20 19:21 20:6 28:15 36:6 42:13 43:6 43:10 49:12,14 50:7 bringing 28:23 44:5 45:18 46:7 55:18 56:3 58:18 **called** 45:21 51:10 brings 7:7 59:14 61:17 62:9 calls 18:8 21:11 auditors 17:18 63:1,4 **Brooks** 3:14 6:9 30:3 54:19 car 33:4 **basis** 59:8 **Buddy** 60:12 audits 33:3 card 27:10,11,16, beginning 16:15 bugs 45:16 46:2 17 29:5 30:4 **August** 53:19 benefit 54:2 63:9 53:23 61:9 burden 59:7.9 automatically benefited 63:6 Bureau 6:8 cards 53:25 29:4 benefits 58:16 care 36:8 **business** 13:9,10 **Avari** 30:12 15:5,21,22 16:4 biased 25:6 carrying 33:6 average 15:12 17:13,14 18:10 cart 27:17 20:2,4,6,9 25:15 big 14:4 24:24,25 29:18 27:21,22 28:3,6,7 31:1 34:1,10 bill 14:16 24:3,14 cartridge 27:18 29:11 31:16 51:1 38:19 39:6,9,13, 52:20,23 53:7,11, **binder** 7:1,21 case 5:7 10:18 19,21 47:6,9 13 54:5,9,14,15, 41:18 53:18 34:10 17 55:19 57:17,20 black 27:7 businesses 56:3 cash 25:21 26:4 62:10 29:7 30:3 53:23 **Bloomington buy** 21:18 25:10 averages 59:14 54:1,3,4 61:8 63:5 32:4,14 27:17 29:8 33:20 34:3,17 39:8 41:4 **CDTFA** 6:8,9,25 **board** 10:16,18 В 7:6,9 8:15 9:14,24 15:17 22:21,22 **buyer** 39:7 10:3,12,18,21 23:1,9,10 28:3,5 **B's** 8:20 buying 29:4 35:4 11:1,10,22,25 38:20 44:19 48:24 41:5 12:14,15 40:17,18 **back** 15:2 18:4,11, board's 10:21 43:16 45:6,9 22 20:9 22:22 **bypass** 39:15 46:14,20,21 **bond** 40:15 23:9 25:3 29:13 63:19,22 30:19 31:21,22 C book 20:17 49:10, **CDTFA's** 7:21 34:5,6,22 38:13, 12 52:1,3,15 57:1 12:5,6 45:6 22 C's 8:21 bookkeeper cent 26:9 **backed** 18:16 22:13 31:7 calculate 51:8,25 **Center** 24:4,7 background 13:1 54:15 57:13 58:4 **books** 14:9,14 cents 26:3 28:17 **backup** 30:21 15:8,10,11,25 calculated 26:10 16:3,18,24 19:18 29:1 49:9 50:11 52:10 bad 21:4 27:9 21:6 59:13 61:17,

clarifications **Cerritos** 2:15 5:1, compares 21:15 contingencies 9:12 39:7 comparing 21:25 contingency cetera 41:3 clean 14:25 39:9 49:1 39:12 challenges 59:6 **clear** 43:17 compiled 48:1 contract 39:3 change 45:8 clearance 39:10 complain 22:6 **control** 39:16 **complete** 48:3,4, changed 16:7 clearing 27:11 19:15 44:23 29:6 60:6 7,8 51:14 53:12 controlling 39:19 61:25 62:1,7,21 changing 35:3 closer 13:6 copy 45:20 46:4 40:9 completed 48:19 closing 4:14 corporation 47:1 channel 5:11 completion 59:5 11:24 12:3 46:22 correct 41:6 chapter 13:17 co-panelist 40:22 compromise 57:24 59:3 14:2 24:23 22:15 collect 13:18,21, corrected 13:15 **charge** 13:13,14 23 14:1,7 49:23 computed 51:1 correctly 7:12 21:18 25:13 28:13 collected 23:23 conclude 31:24 9:11,15 57:23 34:19 50:2,11 concluded 61:22 cost 21:15.16.25 charged 13:13 collecting 39:5 22:2 24:2 25:17 33:14 42:25 concludes 63:14 26:3,9,12 29:16, 53:6 charging 14:20 concluding 2:16 25 34:24 44:2 **Colton** 24:15,16 49:7,14 51:20,24 cheaper 54:3 32:15 33:25 41:3 conclusion 62:20 58:2 60:18,21,23 61:2,14 **check** 40:18 **columns** 57:19 concurrently 10:17 Chevron 34:11 combine 12:2 COUNSEL 3:14 41:3 43:2 45:23 condition 39:15 count 7:7 combined 46:21 Chief 6:7 57:3 conducted 5:11 couple 6:24 32:2 52:22 59:13 commenced **choose** 32:10,20 court 36:5 38:22 47:6 conducting 5:21 choosing 41:12 40:15 commencing conference 7:3, **choosy** 42:16 **cover** 40:9 2:16 6.23 8:5 9:5 43:15 **chose** 35:9 **CPA** 17:16,17 comments 12:16 confirm 9:11 10:2 18:5,6,20 19:2 Christopher 3:14 43:25 commonly 50:3 30:11,14 36:1 6:9 confusion 11:15 37:21,24 38:10 commonsense **city** 39:15 41:22 44:1 25:11 Consigli 16:14 **create** 20:10 **claim** 9:25 10:4,9, 23:8 29:25 communications 13,17,22 11:8,15 44:4.5 consist 8:10 **credit** 15:14 23:18 14:20 15:1 49:21 25:2 27:10,11,16 50:14 52:24 55:25 companies 27:12 consisting 7:1,2, 29:5 30:4 34:6 62:11 21 8:6 53:23,25 61:9 company 35:23 claimed 13:25 contacted 14:18 creditors 14:5 compared 20:2 14:6 47:12,16 44:12 45:12 49:6 50:8.14.20 **crisis** 63:5 55:4 51:25 54:4 57:7, contained 58:23 **crude** 60:9 clarification 9:7, 11 58:2 61:2 contends 59:12. 22 32:1 43:14 62:15 current 10:25 17 45:1

customer 13:11, 12,17,20 14:2 customers 26:8 28:23 **D's** 8:21 daily 16:25 44:10 48:2 60:5 62:1 **Daniel** 15:25 data 16:4 31:11 60:9 61:25 database 52:23 53:14 53:9

D

date 10:20 16:20, 21 18:16 20:17 41:25 44:6,8 day 25:25 28:19 29:3 31:19 34:19 day-by-day 26:4 days 16:23 17:14 20:1 22:24 28:24 40:9 41:24 54:9 **DBA** 24:3,6 deal 38:20 43:11 dealer 40:9 debt 22:15 December 23:15 47:7 52:13 60:10 decide 5:24 **decided** 13:3,8 decision 5:20 10:22 23:15 31:4 60:22 decisions 10:19 **deduct** 26:24 deducted 26:15 55:14 deductions

47:13 defend 31:14,19 defendant 31:18 deficiencies 59:11 deficiency 59:8 63:9 deficient 59:18 deleted 30:3 **denied** 63:13 deny 10:17,22 Department 3:8 6:6 47:9,20,21,22, 24 48:12,14,16, 19,22 49:6 50:8, 14,20 51:6,16,19 52:3,10,15,22,23 53:1,9,12,16,18, 22,24 54:2,4,8,10, 14,17,22 55:1,7, 20,24 56:4,8,12, 6,9,14,21 59:2,7,

16,21,25 57:3,11, 15,18,21,25 58:2, 8,10,12,18,24 60:14,17 61:2,8, 12,16,21 62:6,8, 11,21,25 63:8,12 department's 4:4 8:1 58:24 59:15

deposit 30:4,6 **desert** 32:16 destroyed 45:25 46:1,10,11 determination 15:16 20:12,16

determine 51:20 54:19,23 55:15 56:12 57:4,8 58:24 59:3 62:8,

59:7 61:17

24

determined 47:22 48:14 50:16 54:8 55:20 58:6.

20 59:23 60:17. 22,24 61:4,12 62:25 63:7

53:10 determining 61:10

determines

diesel 47:4,17 48:9 49:18,22 50:9,10,16,17,23 51:1,8,21,25 52:1, 11,12,21,24 53:2, 10,13,16 54:15, 20,24 55:2,8,9,13, 19,20 56:16 57:1, 3 60:10 61:13,14 62:4 63:4

differed 33:3 difference 16:5 20:9 28:7 29:20 36:24 49:4 50:11 differences 16:7 52:19,20 58:20 63:7

differential 54:12,18 57:23 61:10

differentials 54:7

direct 48:16 62:23

directly 21:12 disallowing 10:9 disclosed 61:4 62:13

discount 25:22 29:7 34:4,24 41:14,19

discuss 45:21 discussed 7:3 9:6 13:22 18:5

discovered 57:16

discussion 19:18 63:25

dispute 15:16

disputing 28:3 distributed 7:22 distributor 35:22 44.13

Dital 21:3 29:19 45:13

Dital's 25:14 divide 25:12,20 divided 54:22 dividing 55:3,9 **DNR** 20:22 22:7, 14,17

document 39:23 41:18 42:13 45:23

documentation 60:1 62:21 63:11

documents 8:7, 16 9:1 14:11,12 19:5 22:22 30:16 35:10,25 40:12 41:22 42:2,5,21 43:1 44:17 45:1,7, 25 46:9,13 48:5 60:9,12 61:25

dollar 16:5 25:21, 23 28:18 35:19

dollars 13:16 16:8 22:10 25:12 27:4, 6 47:17 49:3,5,7,8 50:15 57:9 58:12 59:19,20 62:14

Doomid 2:6 5:6 6:11,12,13,15 7:14 18:21 24:3,6, 9,11,14,15 33:14

drive 2:15 33:5 driver's 31:8

due 14:25 26:23 48:11

duly 6:20

established 57:2,6,10 58:5,13 42:9 Ε 53:16 59:21 60:3,13,15, fees 21:13 16,19,25 61:1,6, estimate 12:13 11 field 19:20.23 e-mail 16:16,22 20:15 42:24 48:17 20:20 21:1 42:1 44:4 50:22 exhibits 4:4,5 6:25 7:2,4,9,10, fifty-fifty 40:4 earlier 60:17 estimated 37:17 13,16,22 8:4,6,9, 58:15 figure 17:13 20:5 easiest 25:12 10,12,19,22 9:1 24:2 25:25 26:11 estimates 43:2 easily 15:7 exists 58:25 27:23 41:23 54:22 59:14 electronic 26:4 **expect** 15:12 figured 20:3 estimating 23:3 39:24,25 electronic-39:1 figures 57:24 generated 21:8 expected 56:4 evidence 8:2,16 file 2:6 8:13 21:4 59:15 electronically-9:4 24:14 41:17 30:7 37:22 46:10 generated 29:5 42:5 62:7,18 63:2, expenses 31:7 58:22 employees 17:22 experience 14:22 **filed** 13:17,25 14:2 evidentiary 7:5, 42:12 22:6 24:23 30:10, end 36:4 38:3 17 8:24 14 36:1 40:13 explain 10:8 ex-tax 55:19.20 47:19 52:18 59:7, filer 30:11 ended 22:20 56:13 10 **files** 18:7 ends 30:23 explanation examination filing 21:16 **energy** 53:1,4,6,9 59:2 62:13 42:18 59:9 54:10,14 57:18,21 final 12:5 examined 6:21 extended 19:13 62:11 **Finally** 61:16 examining 19:17 extra 25:22 **Energy's** 52:23 **find** 20:16 41:18 exceeded 60:24 engine 40:8 45:2 54:7 F excise 16:4 21:14, ensure 5:24 finding 63:12 22 26:16.21 factors 54:23 entities 53:5 finds 58:14 62:6 29:21,22 54:6,19 facts 58:23 entitled 25:4 exclude 51:6 finish 19:9 20:15 failed 48:3,8 entity 7:8 excuse 17:1 finished 15:1 61:19 31:21 **entry** 48:5 floor 12:22 46:23 failure 62:6 **exempt** 54:19 environmental **Flores** 15:25 55:25 56:5 fair 16:2 63:3 39:8 folders 48:6 62:1 **exhibit** 7:1.7.15. family 28:11 **equal** 5:20 21 8:1,20,23,24 follow 26:20 fault 13:12 28:13 **Equalization** 9:3 17:5 18:17,18 33:23 34:24 63:24 38:20 23:10,21 30:9,20 favor 36:12 58:19 footnote 10:16 41:17 45:11 equally 5:23 federal 48:22.23 47:14,18 48:25 forget 25:21 49:1,9,15 52:18 equipment 31:1,2 49:5,11,17 50:12, form 35:22 53:14 58:3,10 18,25 51:5,13,17, 39:11 18,23 52:2,6,9,14, **found** 62:18 fee 3:9 21:15.24 error 57:13,16,22 17 53:14,21 62:16,17 feedback 13:4 **Fourth** 51:14 54:11,16,21,25 55:6,12,17,22 escrow 39:2 Franchise 48:24 feel 27:9 28:10 56:1,10,15,20,23

fresh 45:20 28:5,16,18,23 happened 22:3, honest 42:9 60:11 20 Fresno 42:13 **Honor** 12:11 happening 14:19 gasoline 21:17 Friday 34:13,21 hour 12:13 44:14 27:17 47:4 **happy** 36:13 friend 36:14 hours 38:10,23 gave 16:20 19:1 Hat's 34:8 Frito 19:8 44:13 27:14 28:9 44:1 house 27:11 **hates** 36:7 28:11 60:6 generally 26:4 front 17:22 35:11 houses 29:6 36:2 **Headquarters** get all 21:23 6:8 fuel 13:9,20 14:15 hundred 13:10 qive 18:7 23:18 15:4,22 16:4 hear 10:25 13:5 19:20 38:15 25:15 33:21 34:6, 16:9 23:20 21:17,22 28:5 23 35:7 37:24 hundred-some 33:20 35:7 47:4, 39:20 46:7 63:9 heard 5:13 22:9 17 48:18 49:18, 20,22,25 50:2,5,6, **good** 15:22 17:23 hearing 2:18 **hurting** 13:19 9,18 51:10,17,19, 22:5 28:20 40:25 3:11,12,13 5:10, 21,25 52:1,8,11, 12,13,19,22 6:5 goods 49:7,14 I 12,20,21 53:16 7:11 12:7,16 51:20 58:2 54:16,20,24 55:2, 15:17 22:21 23:15 idea 45:13 8,9,13 57:1 60:7, Great 8:14 11:14 38:6,22 42:10 10 61:13,14 62:4 57:15 identification grocery 19:7 63:4 8:25 hearings 33:3 gross 27:11,13 full 48:12 51:2 38:7 identified 7:13 29:10 31:3 49:1 fully 32:4 heat 33:5 identify 6:2 guess 10:11 37:1, Heath 6:7 12 44:25 impact 37:2 G **held** 5:7 guessing 39:1 impacted 36:19, 20 hell 17:25 **guilty** 31:9,11,17, **gallon** 21:14 20 32:11 25:10,12,21 26:20 imposed 61:16 **Hey** 32:25 27:19 28:7,17,18, **guts** 36:7 impression high 50:24 51:11, 19 29:1,7 34:7 42:11 guy 18:3 19:11 22 56:23 35:5 36:13 41:6. 25:6 28:8,10 15,19 49:20 inaccurate 27:23 higher 61:9 62:17 32:10 36:7,12 50:16,23 51:11,21 61:18 38:4 highest 28:6 52:8 53:17 55:1, inadequate 61:23 15 56:17,22 guys 14:25 17:24 **Highway** 24:7,11 60:18,24 61:3 incentivize 41:4 hire 17:15,16 31:6 gallonage 20:8 **include** 26:19 Н **hired** 36:4 51:1 **gallons** 15:13 25:11,23 27:19 history 18:16 half 20:10 23:18 included 10:16 33:20 34:5,13,21 35:18 40:8 21:22,23 26:23 50:17,22 55:2,8,9, **hoc** 20:13 **hand** 6:18,23 including 53:7 13,14,16,18 14:16 31:10 54:5,20 **Hoffman** 18:13,20 garage 28:22 19:3 30:10,12,14 handle 18:3 income 7:8 17:4,5 garnishment 18:12 19:8 30:6,9, **HANNA** 2:18 hold 25:4 20:7 10,15,20 31:3 holding 25:3 **happen** 29:17 36:1 38:2,11 39:1 gas 21:18,19 35:20 48:22,24 49:1,9, 25:11,13 27:24

15 52:19 58:3,10 involved 17:20 **June** 15:20 16:14 liability 15:15 19:4 20:11 57:24 17:7 18:17 26:7 incomplete **issue** 11:17 22:7 58:25 59:3,14,23 30:23,24 47:10 61:18,23 25:5 46:12 jurisdiction 10:2, lie 43:4.6 incorrect 33:10 **issued** 20:22 14,24 11:9,12 22:11 59:18 life 22:16 38:17 increased 58:11 likewise 58:8 **issuer** 27:10 independency Κ 35:4 issues 9:6,8,12, list 52:23 13,16 13:12 kind 13:18 14:3 **listed** 9:7,8,9,12 independent 16:1,15 27:8 30:4 35:3 43:16 53:1 **items** 9:7 47:5 11:10 31:21 36:12 48:18 indirect 47:21 listen 22:23 42:18 knew 25:2 48:17 listened 23:11 J **Kwee** 3:2 5:5,14 individually litigated 36:4 6:10,14,23 7:14, 27:16 January 25:20 19,21 8:3,14,18 litigation 40:14 infested 46:2 47:10 9:5.18.21 10:6.11 live-streamed 11:4,8,14 12:5,12, inflating 59:15 **Jason** 3:13 6:7 5:10 18,22 13:4 31:24 information 5:24 **JENKIN** 2:18 32:1,12 33:8,14, livestream 13:5 18:24 20:19 31:15 19,22,24 35:1 **iob** 34:9 48:5,9 50:8 51:3, load 29:8 36:8,18,22 37:1,9, 16,20 53:4,7 Josh 3:3 5:15 12,19 40:16,21 loads 34:12 55:24 58:18,23 41:2 43:19,20 **iournals** 48:7.9 63:2 loans 31:2 44:25 45:3,5 46:12,17,20 judge 5:5,15,17, inquiry 18:15 local 28:4 63:17,21,24 21,22 6:10,14,21, interest 14:12 **location** 24:4,12 23 7:12,14,19,21 15:8 16:16 29:10 33:10 41:3 44:15 8:2,3,14,18 9:4,5, L 34:17,19 53:19 17,18,21 10:6,11 11:4,8,14 12:2,5, interested 21:9 locations 27:24 labor 14:14 40:4, 12,17,18,21,22 27:20 33:2.7 7,10 long 12:25 13:4 31:4,24 32:1, 41:20 42:14 12 33:8,14,19,22, lack 48:11 longer 16:10 21:1 interrupt 5:22 24 35:1 36:8,18, 59:24 lady 14:13 22 37:1,9,12,19 invested 45:16 looked 14:10 16:3 40:16,20,21,23,25 **laptop** 34:17 investigation 41:2,13,17 42:3,7, 20:21 21:6,8 large 41:4,5 52:22 22:10 23:13.14 20 43:1,8,13,18, 20,21,22,24,25 lasting 29:17 invoice 13:14 Los 32:15 44:16,20,25 45:3, 15:7 24:8,18 **law** 5:14 6:21 8:2 lose 28:11 5 46:12,15,16,17, 27:18 9:4 26:21 59:4 19,20,25 63:17, losing 49:13 invoices 21:12 18,20,21,23,24 **Lay** 19:8 44:13 23:23,24 24:1 loss 14:4 judges 5:14,19 lead 3:2 5:15,21 31:15 32:2,7,8 42:10 losses 22:14 33:8 34:3,5 35:23 leaving 42:16 37:2,3 41:2,11 July 2:17 5:1,8 lost 24:22 40:14 left 21:13 35:7 42:20,22,23,24 47:6 52:8 45:12,14,23 51:15 letter 18:13 jumping 36:14 **low** 50:24 51:11, 52:12 60:8,18 22 52:20 56:22 62:5

61:7,8 63:5 matchbooks 55:24,25 56:4,5,6, **named** 21:3 46:5 9,18 57:4 lower 54:9 **names** 43:10 matches 29:11 **minor** 16:7 lowest 28:6 58:19 nation 20:2 63:7.8 matter 2:5 5:6 minutes 9:9,11, national 20:4,9 9:24 10:18 15,22 11:20,22,24 lying 19:21 27:21,22 28:3 12:3,23 46:22 matters 6:25 29:11 31:16 miscellaneous M measure 59:19 **Nazari** 3:6 4:10,16 47:5 63:9 6:13,19 7:14,18, missing 20:20 20 8:9,12 9:20 machine 37:25 mechanic 13:2 11:4,7,13 12:2,11, mistake 24:23 made 23:15 24:23 meet 5:19 16:21 18,21,25 13:8 38:12 38:12 47:3 49:13 18:14,25 19:16 31:25 32:7,14 36:3 37:21 38:4, modification 33:11,17,20,23,25 mail 41:10 12:9 35:2 36:11,21,24 10 maintain 59:1 37:3,11,14,20 Mojave 24:5,7,10, member 5:16,17 41:7,16,20 42:6,8, majority 24:13 22:21 23:11 11,17,20 39:15 23 43:3,9 44:3,19, 47:2 make 9:22 27:9 members 3:3 22 45:2,4,11 28:7,18,21,22 23:10 Monday 53:19,20 needed 5:24 22:5 29:25 32:5,10 mentioned 60:17 **Mondays** 17:2,10 33:16 34:10 36:24 negative 48:11 18:25 30:17 38:16 39:8,13,14 49:10,12 52:3,15, merchandise 44:11 59:1 21 60:23 48:10 55:25 56:4, money 13:18,19, 6,9,13 62:5 20 14:5 24:22 making 25:15 negligence 47:24 27:19 28:25 32:23 28:19,25 43:10 61:16 62:8,19 messed 35:16 35:3 36:21,25 57:19 61:9 net 51:10 met 19:12 39:14,18 49:13 man 17:18 21:7,8 52:8 non-taxable method 62:23 manipulated Montebello 24:19 21:13 63:8 21:4 32:4 nonsense 16:19 methods 48:20 manipulating month 15:6 26:7 nontaxable 47:5 microphone 13:6 26:15 37:24 38:2 39:22 noted 9:24 52:3, middle 16:14 33:5 mark 8:19 monthly 37:23 15 53:24 56:21 miles 24:16 27:25 marked 8:6,22,24 **months** 15:5 **notice** 14:8 15:19, 39:25 million 27:4 33:20 34:18 39:13,17, 24 59:6 18,22 47:16 49:3,4,7,8 market 28:22 noticed 9:22 50:15,17 55:2,16, morning 34:22 markets 35:4 18 57:9 58:12 November 10:20 40:25 59:19,20 62:14 markup 23:4,6 18:22 moving 13:6 28:17 29:12 mind 13:5 19:15 **number** 5:7 18:18 49:10,12,16 52:1, multiply 14:15 44:23 25:5 31:22 38:1 11 57:25 58:4,7 15:13 26:22 mini 28:22 47:4 50:22 61:4 51:4 numerous 53:4 markups 48:12 Ν minimarket 52:4.16.21 57:1 56:13 60:23 61:7 0 n-word 17:24 minimart 47:2 mart 47:5 51:4 Nalan 3:11 6:5 48:18 51:2,7 objection 7:24

Index: objections..plugs

8:17 9:2 11:1 orders 9:11,15 25:16 31:5,16 percentage 35:10 37:6,16,22 36:25 39:25 objections 7:4, original 18:12,15 38:5,8,25 40:14 performed 57:25 16,19 8:15 11:3,5, 22:3,4 23:8,17 41:24 29:25 46:4 48:5 period 10:8 12:6 paperwork 15:5 observation 54:9 originally 15:14 16:13,24 17:1,2 18:13,16 19:18 19:14 20:6 22:13 observations OTA 5:7 8:8,24 20:15,18,21 21:9 34:17 36:11 23:22 27:8 35:13, 51:10 10:13,24 44:2,18, 47:10,11,23 48:6 19,20 19 43:5 observed 20:1 49:4 50:18,21 Park 2:15 **OTA's** 5:10,12 51:5,9,12,15,22 53:18,22 57:17,19 9:23 10:22 11:9 52:1,4,13,16,25 obtained 53:12 Parker 3:13 6:7 54:13 55:3,11,21 outlet 15:4 occurred 61:7 56:14,19 57:1,5, **part** 13:15 24:12 outlier 28:1 30:22 40:10 42:4, 10,14 58:12 60:2, October 52:13 10 44:23 23 61:24 62:5,12, outliers 27:23 offer 34:11 16 participant 5:20 outstanding **permit** 55:10 offered 27:15 participate 5:23 13:16 30:2 Persian 17:23 parties 6:1 7:23 overstated 37:5, offering 30:15 person 5:11 9:10 11:19 8,15 13:13 22:18 24:22 office 2:1 5:7 parts 14:14 40:3 owe 31:12 32:22 18:21 30:13 personal 25:7 35:16 38:15 41:23,25 44:6 party 11:23 owed 13:19 personally 19:20 **passed** 36:11 officer 20:21 44:12 owes 25:3 offices 5:12 passing 34:1 petition 8:8 9:23, 24 10:12,19,21 oil 35:23 60:9 pay 13:20,24 14:5, Ρ 11:10 22:6 7 16:24 19:9 one-day 35:22 21:20 25:10 27:1 phonetic 21:3 **p.m.** 18:22 29:6,8 31:2,6 ongoing 15:17 30:13 34:18 35:24 38:2 pages 7:1 8:5 opened 13:1 15:4 pick 32:10,20 35:9 47:14 53:15 59:21 paying 22:12 opening 5:5 **picking** 41:12 paid 13:21 14:1 payment 38:16 11:20,22 12:3,4,6, 42:17 19:7 26:24 27:13, 39:14 19 46:22 20 50:1,7 53:23, pickup 40:6 penalty 23:17 operated 47:2 47:24 61:17 **picky** 42:16 operating 39:22 panel 3:2,3 5:13, picture 45:17 penny 38:12 16,17,22 63:15 operation 39:19 pictures 46:10 **people** 17:24 47:7 **panel's** 46:14 29:4,12 35:14 piggyback 43:24 **Operations** 6:7 paper 16:17,25 38:7 43:12 17:8 18:11 19:1, **place** 13:9 opinion 9:23 people's 20:23 13 20:23 22:24 10:15,23 32:7 placement 57:22 23:3 27:2 29:13 **Pepsi** 19:8 44:12 **opted** 51:16 30:16 31:13 32:24 plaintiff 31:18 percent 13:10 33:1 35:18,22 oral 50:22 **Plaza** 2:15 19:20 40:3 47:24 36:2 37:20 39:3 order 9:9.22 49:11,17 56:5,6, 44:9 plugs 40:7,8,10 10 57:14 58:5,7 11:19,25 54:6 papers 15:10 18:4 61:5 62:17

Index: PO..re-audit

PO 24:9,15 **price** 21:21 22:2 property 14:5 Q 25:10 26:5 29:7 39:3,8,12 point 21:8 25:18, 34:4,14,23 41:6, 23 26:4,10 43:9, proposed 18:20 15,19 50:23 51:11 quantity 50:5,6 53:11 54:7,12,15, prove 31:10,20 **quarter** 10:1,5 pointed 32:2 18,20,24 56:17,22 32:18,22 35:18 14:15 52:4,5 61:3,10,14 39:2 portion 15:1 54:24 60:5 **prices** 20:1 25:15 provide 15:9,11 40:19 45:19 quarterly 50:22 49:19,23 28:5 34:8 35:24 22:25 28:2 48:3,4, 54:13,15,17 55:19 51:1,24,25 52:20, 7,8,22 51:3,14 POS 25:20 26:13 61:2 24 53:3,7,13,17, 53:12 55:23 61:24 29:3 48:2,5 61:25 22,24 54:1,3,4,5, 62:4,7,20 quarters 52:16 62:1 8,10,14 55:19 61:5 provided 11:23 position 58:24 57:17,20,21 60:9, 18:24 23:21 28:1 question 10:11, 10,21,24 61:9,10 possibly 29:17 44:2 59:25 60:4, 15 33:15 36:18 62:10 18 63:10 37:1,12 41:13 post 40:15 49:16 **pricing** 15:13 43:25 44:16.18 provider 42:21 20:2.4 28:3 29:11 posted 28:5 53:18 45:5 published 10:23 **Prieto** 14:18 potentially 45:8 questioning 19:3 54:10 57:17,21 16:10 60:11 62:10 **poured** 38:18 questions 5:23 print 29:3 44:14 12:15,18 40:18, pre-prepayment **pull** 34:12,14,21 22.23 41:1 43:22 printed 29:3 35:8 36:16 13:14 44:21 46:14,15,18 prior 19:12 20:5 pulled 11:6 18:4 prehearing 7:3,6, 63:15,19,20,22,23 23:17 61:21 62:18 34:5 23 8:5 9:5 43:15 problem 20:24 pulling 11:1 preliminary 6:24 R 38:24 prepaid 27:3 pump 21:21 29:4 racist 43:10 procedural 7:4 47:17 49:21,23 purchase 16:3 50:7,9,10,14 rack 34:4,23 36:9 procedure 17:12 20:8 22:2 27:16 52:19.25 55:3.5.9. 63:25 29:7 45:14 48:8 proceed 12:12,23 10 62:11 51:15,16,19 52:12 raise 6:17 46:18 preparation 55:23 60:7,18 **PROCEEDINGS Ramos** 60:8 57:15 62:5 2:14 range 51:11 purchased 49:20, prepared 48:1 process 42:4 25 50:6,17 55:2, ranging 50:23 **prepay** 49:19 15 produce 5:20 51:21 56:22 prepayment purchases 19:6 produced 6:20 rate 14:16 26:22 13:24 26:25 27:2, 23:6,25 33:16 28:14 50:16 54:23 17:5 63:2 3 50:2,16 44:10 47:17 48:10 55:5,11 57:13 profit 15:22 29:11 53:23,25 present 29:9 62:16,17,18 39:20 purposes 8:25 presentation 4:8 **ratio** 56:8,12 promotion 34:16 61:19,23 11:19,20,23 12:1, rats 45:16 46:2 7,20,24 45:6 promotional 36:9 put 6:23 22:21 46:24 47:19 63:14 RAVENDER 3:12 27:17 36:2 39:15 **proof** 59:9 41:11 previously 8:7 re-audit 20:23,25 10:12 61:21 proper 59:5 21:3 45:9 59:23 60:22.25 61:4

Index: readings..sale

readings 19:25 reduction 41:6 19 26:18 27:10,13 59:15 62:16 37:5,7,8 39:8 refer 43:18 resulting 47:13 ready 12:12 17:3, 45:22 46:8 48:7 9 46:14 referenced 41:1 49:21 50:1 61:20 results 19:17 real 35:11 36:5 29:14 63:3 referred 41:2 50:3 reported 2:17 reason 18:1 22:18 16:6 20:6,7 47:11, retail 13:9 14:21 referring 43:2 13,20 48:12,13,21 15:4 20:8 33:13, 44:17 reasonable 58:7, 49:2,6,10,12 21 37:10,15 47:3 8,16,18 59:9 63:3, refineries 34:2 50:10,20 51:4,7,8, 49:18 52:24 53:7, 6,10 24,25 52:3,4,7,15, 17 54:1,3,4 55:16 reflected 49:8.15 reasonableness 20,21 55:10 retailer 34:24 58:3,10 48:20 58:1 56:16,17,21,25 refund 9:25 10:4, 57:7,12 58:9 62:2, retailers 36:10 **rebate** 42:25 14,15,22 10,13,17,22 11:8, 49:24 50:5 rebuttal 12:6 15 14:6 Reporter 2:18 retailing 24:5 recalculated refused 20:14 reporting 50:4,6 retain 18:6 56:16,25 30:18 36:3 38:4 reports 19:5 28:2 retained 17:17 recap 11:19 refusing 23:12 29:5 48:2 60:6 return 30:6 36:1 62:1 regions 53:8 receipt 49:2 49:1,16 50:3,4 represent 6:2 receipts 29:6 rehearing 5:6 8:8 52:19 55:4 58:4. 46:7 9:23,25 10:12,19, 10,22 59:5 receive 7:15 21 11:10 representative returns 7:8 17:4,5 received 4:4,5 8:1 6:6,11,15 19:9 47:25 48:22, reimbursement 9:3 15:23 39:18 24 49:9 58:23 54:6,21 representatives 41:5 48:23 60:4 62:3 6:3,11 rejected 47:20 recently 17:4 review 15:6 18:7 60:15 61:14 request 12:10 45:7 recommend related 10:17 59:2 20:22 Richard 16:14 23:25 requested 46:21 recommended 23:8 48:23 relevant 33:9 22:4,7,8,23 47:24 Ridenour 3:4 requests 63:12 reliable 48:11 reconciliation 5:17 43:21,22,24 required 49:19, relied 54:3 55:25 44:16,20 46:17,19 60:6 20,23 50:1 60:1 63:21,23 record 5:5 6:1 rely 58:22 requirement road 34:14 39:6 7:5,17 8:25 19:9 remarks 11:24 16:22 35:21 44:23 48:15 run 23:16 39:13, 12:3 43:10 resale 55:8,14 recorded 47:20 21 remember 26:20 48:12,13 52:10,21 respect 9:13 44:12 S records 14:9 responded remit 50:1 15:8,10,11 16:1, 18:18,19,22 46:6 18,25 21:7 48:3, rent 39:5,20 Sacramento response 19:11 11 53:12 59:2,4, 23:15 **REP** 3:11,12,13 13 61:18,22 62:7 responsible 53:6 **sale** 14:21 21:8, repair 13:2 reduce 22:7 23:16 16,17 25:21,22 result 22:25 31:8 repeat 9:10 26:4,9,23,24 27:3 62:8 reduced 22:8 29:6 30:22 32:17 54:17 59:18 report 14:8 15:6 resulted 14:8 47:3 48:18 49:3,6, 16:5 20:13 25:17,

Index: sales..storage

specific 10:14 14 55:20 56:1,10, 24 40:10 47:4 shipping 32:8 55:16 61:13 13,18 57:5,12 Speedway 24:3, **shop** 13:2 39:5 58:7 62:15 selling 21:17 40:2 6,9,10 sales 13:15.24 25:15 26:1,2,5,7, **short** 27:5 38:13 **spend** 38:9,10,23 16:3 17:1 19:5 8,12,14 28:8 41:7 21:13,20,22,23,25 29:16 33:25 50:23 spider 46:2 23:5 26:13,16,17, 51:24 52:20 53:2, **show** 10:9 14:12 **spot** 34:3 18,19,23,25 27:3 11,17,22,24 20:24 29:10 30:21 29:23 30:25 31:3 54:18,20,24 55:19 31:13,23 32:18 stacks 60:8 44:14 47:12,13, 56:17,21 57:20 35:17 **staff** 23:13.14 60:21,24 61:3,8, 17,21,23,25 48:1, showed 30:3 2,3,4,5,7,13,15,21 10 63:5 standard 15:1 43:3.5 49:4 49:14,19,21,24 sells 27:24 start 6:3 12:14,16 50:1,2,7,9,10,15, showing 15:10 23:3 24:25 43:9 21 51:2,3,4,7,8,9 send 16:16 22:17. 41:21 44:8 63:17 52:11,19,25 53:12 24 23:7,10 31:21 **shows** 30:6,20 54:5,20,23 55:3,4, started 6:25 13:1 separate 43:16 39:3 41:18 45:23 5,9,11,23 56:4,5, 14:10 15:25 17:15 46:10 63:2 6,7,9,19 57:3,4,7, separating 37:25 19:19 28:25 40:2 8,9,12,17 58:1,2, side 32:18 September 39:4 state 2:2 3:8 8:13 8,9,11,17 59:4,5, 53:20 Sierra 24:7,11 13:25 14:7,10 16 60:2,4,5,6 17:16 22:16,21,24 61:18,20,23,25 service 39:6 sign 16:11 19:13, 23:9 26:16,20,21 62:1,2,9,11,14,22, 14 set 18:23 36:21 27:5 29:22 30:3,8 24 63:1 41:24 44:6,7 signed 22:17 33:4 35:14 38:20 salvage 14:3 42:9,10,11 43:5 setting 19:14 23:3 similar 56:3 44:19 54:6 Samarawickrem 41:25 simple 25:9 a 3:11 4:11 6:5 **stated** 47:25 **settle** 22:15 7:12 8:17 9:17 simplest 25:8 statement 4:14 10:4,7 11:3 12:17 settlement 38:17 17:4 37:23 60:7 **single** 42:13 40:20 45:10 46:25 **SG** 16:5 36:20.24 statements 19:9 sit 22:11 39:23 sand 17:24 37:5,7,8,15 55:10 30:3 sitting 17:9 45:14 sat 44:13 SHAHRIAR 3:6 statewide 53:2 situation 14:11, satisfied 58:21 **share** 29:8 35:10 station 28:16 19 41:9 Saturday 34:21 smells 46:3 stations 27:24 shared 41:8 save 34:24 28:18 53:10 **smelly** 45:17 SHARMA 3:12 **saving** 36:13,15 statistics 53:2 sold 14:15 15:13 **Shawn** 3:6 6:13 schedule 38:11 22:1 25:23 28:16 **stay** 24:24 49:21 50:4,5 **Sheriene** 3:4 5:17 30:21 31:1 33:12 sticking 27:21 57:16,24 39:3,10,12 47:5 shift 12:6 16:25 49:7,15 50:5 **stop** 15:3 24:11, **SDNR** 22:8,10 25:16 44:9,10 51:20 52:8 55:8, 16,19 28:16 35:4 23:16 shifts 59:9 13 39:16 40:15 47:2 seat 31:8 **ship** 24:6 32:3 source 45:7 60:10 **stops** 32:3 seized 47:7 61:25 62:21 **shipped** 24:10. storage 21:14 **sell** 15:12 23:6 15,19 33:12 spark 40:7,8,9 45:14,15,16 28:14 37:24 39:9,

store 19:7 28:22 support 51:3 26:17 47:5,13,21 17:21 18:21 19:13 32:14 60:1,3 62:2 63:11 48:13,15,18,21 21:1 22:12 26:20 50:20 51:4,7,8 31:6,18,21 38:17 **story** 12:25 surprised 17:12 56:4,8,13,17,18 43:18 49:13 52:8 **street** 27:25 **surveys** 53:10 57:4,5,7,8,9,12 timely 8:4 10:18 58:1,7,8,11,17 strike 12:5 swear 6:17 59:16,19 60:1 times 34:12 Strong 24:9 60:8 61:20 62:9,14,15 sweating 33:6 tired 15:21 taxes 13:21 14:1,7 **struck** 11:16 **sworn** 6:20 today 5:8 6:16 21:21 22:7 27:4 sub-issue 10:1. system 25:20 8:11 12:1 38:25 28:15 35:6 51:2 14 11:2,6,11,15, 26:13 29:3 62:22 **today's** 5:10,13 16 systems 48:2 7:11 taxpayer 9:2 sub-issues 9:8 15:9,11 21:16 told 14:19 33:4 40:24 41:8 45:24 Т subject 11:10 36:6 46:9 59:1,6,10 submit 42:4 **top** 14:16 15:15 **T-CHEK** 60:7 taxpayers 8:22 submitted 7:6 **total** 12:7 47:12 **takes** 18:7 telling 25:3 26:2 8:4.8 44:18.22 49:3,6 50:22 42:16 55:14,15 56:5,6 taking 29:21 substance 11:18 60:8 ten 27:6 talk 18:8 22:11 substantiate trace 39:23 testified 6:21 44:1 **talking** 14:13 transaction 17:17,25 28:14 subtracted 57:23 testifying 6:16 36:23 32:9 33:17 35:8 testimony 11:21 successor 47:8 transactions tank 21:15 40:19 36:10 suggestion tax 2:1 3:8,14 5:7 tests 19:20,23 45:13 **TRANSCRIPT** 6:4 7:8 10:18 **Suite** 2:15 thing 16:9 19:12 2:14 13:15,24 14:16,25 22:20 23:2,20 16:4 17:4,5 18:12 transmission summarize 7:10 25:1,8,9 26:6 19:8 21:13,20,22, 9:11 60:7 27:15 37:14 39:7 23 22:8 23:16 40:1,4 41:24 transportation summarized 26:15,16,17,18, 45:24 27:12 34:15 9:15 19,21,22,23,25 27:3 28:14 29:12, things 46:6 **Travel** 24:4,7 summary 48:1 21,22,23 30:6,9, 52:11 60:5 thinking 10:24 truck 15:3 24:10, 11,15,20 31:3,12 summer 33:5 15,16,19 28:16 36:1 38:2,11 39:2 thirty 12:13 22:23, 32:3 35:3 39:16 47:17,23,25 24 supervisor 14:18 40:6 47:2 48:22,24 49:1,9, 16:10 21:2 22:4 thought 23:19 15,19,21,24 50:1, 29:13 true 35:18 2,7,9,10,15,16 thousand 13:16 truth 40:5 supplemental 51:10 52:19,25 22:10 27:5,6 59:18 60:22 54:5,6,19,20,23 38:15,16 tune 40:6 55:3,4,5,9,11 supplier 20:7 throw 17:21 turn 8:3 11:18,21 58:3,10,22,25 23:23 12:13,19 40:17,21 59:3,4,5 60:4 Thursday 2:17 43:20 45:5 46:14, suppliers 21:11, 61:19,23 62:2,12, 5:1,8 18:22 53:19 12 45:12,21,22 24 63:1 20,22 time 5:9,23 12:6,7, 49:24 50:7 types 47:12 taxable 21:16,25 13 14:6 15:4

U

ultimately 44:18 60:15 63:7

unable 52:18 62:21

unbearable 46:3

unchanged 12:8

uncollectible 13:24

underground 21:14

underreported 31:12 32:17

understand 6:14 42:3,4 46:12

understanding 9:14,19 10:3 11:5, 25 16:2 32:5

unreasonable 61:13

unreported 47:23 57:9,11 58:11,17 62:24 63:1

unspecified 60:10

upfront 27:4

usual 15:9

٧

validating 22:3

valued 59:11

values 57:17

vendor 16:6

vendors 50:10 51:17 60:19

Ventura 29:16

verification 48:19 verified 48:15

verify 48:20 58:1 62:22

volumes 41:5

voted 10:17

W

waited 20:25

waiting 19:24

waive 23:17

wanted 10:23 15:2,8,21 16:23, 25 17:2,10 38:5

warranted 45:9

wasted 24:25 watch 42:25

ways 36:17

webs 46:2

website 10:23 60:11

week 18:4 29:18 36:16 53:9,11

weekly 25:15 26:6 52:24 53:7,13 54:5,10,14 57:17, 20 62:10

weeks 17:14

white 27:7

wholesale 13:10 14:22 33:11 34:9 35:25 36:10,22 47:3 49:22

wholesalers 35:5

49:24

withdrew 9:24 10:12,21

witnesses 36:5

work 35:14

working 28:17 29:12 30:13

works 17:12 34:16,20 36:16

worksheets 48:1 52:12 60:5

written 5:20

wrong 23:5 32:23 35:15 38:13,19 43:4 57:18

Υ

year 15:3 27:4 38:3

years 15:18 16:1 17:13 20:6,10 24:25 28:24 30:8, 19 38:9,18,21 41:9 42:12 45:15 49:2

yield 63:8

Youtube 5:11