BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ΙN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF,)			
F.	VENI	EGAS,)	OTA	NO.	220810986
		•		A.	PPELLAN'	Γ.)			
)			

TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Wednesday, September 20, 2023

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,)
6	F. VENEGAS, THE APPEAL OF,) OTA NO. 220810986
7	APPELLANT.)
8)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Transcript of Electronic Proceedings,
15	taken in the State of California, commencing
16	at 9:35 a.m. and concluding at 10:04 a.m. on
17	Wednesday, September 20, 2023, reported by
18	Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter, in and
19	for the State of California.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:		
2			
3	Administrative Law Judge:	JUDGE VERONICA LONG	
4	For the Appellant:	F. VENEGAS	
5	ror the Apperrant.	C. VENEGAS	
6	For the Degrandent.	CHARE OF CALLEODALA	
7	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD	
8		JOEL SMITH	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

		-
1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2		
3	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
4		
5	(Appellant's Exhibit 1 was received at page 7.)	
6	(Department's Exhibits A-G were received at page 6.)	
7		
8	<u>PRESENTATION</u>	
9	DAGE	
10	<u>PAGE</u>	
11	By Mrs. Venegas 7	
12	By Mr. Smith 12	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	California; Wednesday, September 20, 2023
2	9:35 a.m.
3	
4	JUDGE LONG: We are now going on the record.
5	This is the Appeal of Venegas, OTA Case No.
6	220810986. Today is Wednesday, September 20th, and the
7	time is approximately 9:35 a.m. We're holding this
8	hearing today electronically with the agreement of all of
9	the parties.
10	As a reminder the OTA is not a court. We are an
11	independent appeals body. OTA is staffed by tax experts
12	and is independent of the State's tax agencies. We do not
13	engage in ex parte communication. Our decisions are based
14	on arguments and evidence provided by the parties on
15	appeal in conjunction with the appropriate application of
16	law.
17	I have read the briefs and examined the submitted
18	exhibits. My name is Judge Veronica Long, and I will be
19	the Administrative Law Judge for this appeal.
20	I'm going to have the parties please each
21	identify yourselves by stating your name for the record.
22	I'm going to begin with the Appellants.
23	Mr. Venegas.
24	MRS. VENEGAS: State your name.
25	MR. VENEGAS: Fernando Venegas.

JUDGE LONG: All right. And is that -- sorry --1 2 Mrs. Venegas or Ms. Venegas? 3 MRS. VENEGAS: Mrs. Cindy Venegas. JUDGE LONG: Mrs. Cindy Venegas. All right. 4 And Franchise Tax Board? 5 6 MR. SMITH: Good morning. Joel Smith with 7 Franchise Tax Board. 8 JUDGE LONG: All right. I'm going to go ahead 9 and restate the issues that were agreed on in this case. 10 The first issue is whether Appellant has established that 11 he did not have a filing requirement for the 2019 tax 12 year. The second issue is whether Appellant has 13 demonstrated reasonable cause to abate the late-filing 14 penalty. 15 With respect to the evidentiary record, FTB has 16 provided Exhibits A through G. Appellants have not 17 objected to the admissibility of the exhibits. Therefore, 18 the exhibits are now admitted into the record. 19 (Department's Exhibits A-G were received in 20 evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 21 JUDGE LONG: Appellant has provided Exhibit 1. 22 FTB did not object to the admissibility of this exhibit 23 and therefore, that exhibit is now entered into the 2.4 record. 25 ///

(Appellant's Exhibit 1 was received in

evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)

JUGE LONG: No additional exhibits have been presented today.

And with that, Mr. And Mrs. Venegas, you have 10 minutes, and you may begin whenever you are ready.

2.4

PRESENTATION

MRS. VENEGAS: So our objection is Fernando

Venegas was unemployed. He became unemployed in October

of 2018 by his employer Mark Christopher Chevrolet, and

through the entire year of 2019 he remained unemployed.

In -- also in October of 2018, I was diagnosed with

ovarian -- an advanced stage of ovarian cancer, and

Fernando made the decision to attempt to collect

unemployment while I was going to attempt to begin

chemotherapy and undergo emergency -- a surgery for the --

JUDGE LONG: Mr. And Mrs. Venegas, I'm going to interrupt you for just a moment. What you're currently — it sounds like what you're currently offering is testimony, and I want to swear you both in as witnesses. That way your testimony can be considered as evidence. If I don't swear you in, then it's considered argument.

MRS. VENEGAS: Okay.

JUDGE LONG: So I'm going to go ahead and swear

1	you in, if that is fine with you?
2	MR. VENEGAS: Yes.
3	MRS. VENEGAS: Okay.
4	JUDGE LONG: All right. Mrs. Cindy Venegas, can
5	you please raise your right hand.
6	
7	C. VENEGAS,
8	produced as a witness, and having been first duly sworn by
9	the Administrative Law Judge, was examined, and testified
10	as follows:
11	
12	JUDGE LONG: All right now Mr. Venegas.
13	
14	F. VENEGAS,
15	produced as a witness, and having been first duly sworn by
16	the Administrative Law Judge, was examined, and testified
17	as follows:
18	
19	JUDGE LONG: All right. Thank you. I'll let you
20	go ahead and resume. Thanks.
21	MRS. VENEGAS: Should I start in the beginning?
22	MR. VENEGAS: Should she start over?
23	JUDGE LONG: Yes, please.
24	MRS. VENEGAS: Okay. So in October of 2018
25	Fernando became unemployed by his employer Mark

Christopher Chevrolet --

2.4

MR. VENEGAS: In Ontario.

MRS. VENEGAS: -- in Ontario, California. Also in October of 2018, I was diagnosed with an advanced stage of ovarian cancer. Fernando made the decision to attempt to apply for unemployment and stay with me throughout the beginning of the process of chemotherapy and also surgical procedures for my diagnoses. Fernando attempted to apply for unemployment several times, and I believe that once or twice he was denied. So what we did was we had to resource -- he resourced to apply for financial assistance with the State for monetary assistance, food assistance, and for medical health insurance.

Also, at that time, I was employed. And I was due to go back to work in January of 2019. But due to the severity of the chemotherapy treatments, I was unable to go back when the date that my employer requested.

Therefore, my employer decided to terminate my employment, and I had to also resource to -- it was temporary disability that I became eligible for and also became eligible for state medical health insurance. At that time, the funds that we had were simply state -- state assistance, government assistance, and later on disability kicked in for me.

My -- our children also became eligible for state

disability because they are minors. And so due to my work history, they became eligible to receive monthly monetary assistance. And for the year of 2019 what we were living off was my Social Security benefits, including the monetary monthly payments that my children were receiving.

2.4

So, all myself, my two children were receiving monthly Social Security payments. And that's how we were able to scrape by and pay our mortgage. With the food assistance programs with the State, we were able to purchase food. And with family support, we were able to pay some of our bills because our family did start a GoFundMe account. And we collected some funds and that went to -- towards the assistance of paying our utility bills and stuff like that.

So, yes, the entire year of 2019 Fernando was unemployed. And the payments for the mortgage, which I believe is what is in question, they were paid with my -- with the combination of my Social Security and the Social Security benefits that my two -- our two minor children were receiving.

The last detail is that we decided to rent a room in our home to a known person. We put an ad online and somebody -- we interviewed a few people, and we decided to rent the room -- a room in our home to a family, a couple with three children. And they lived in our home and paid

us rent for about -- for about approximately the entire year -- a little bit over a year of 2019, going into 2020.

And that's really what helped us stay afloat.

I do have still the contact information for the renters. So they are able to provide testimony that, you know, they were be renting from us at that time. They — they are able to provide testimony that they witnessed that I was undergoing really aggressive chemo therapy treatments and that Fernando was at home during that time.

JUDGE LONG: All right. Mr. and Mrs. Venegas, does that include your presentation?

MRS. VENEGAS: Yes.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE LONG: I'd like to ask you just a couple of questions. I want to confirm. Have you filed a return for 2019?

MRS. VENEGAS: No, we did not. We did not because Fernando did not have a W-2. So from our understanding -- I mean, how would we?

JUDGE LONG: I understand what you're saying.

All right. Let's see. And I also would like to ask. You said you received rental income for the room. Could you approximate how much -- well, let me ask instead, how many dependent children did you have in 2019?

MRS. VENEGAS: Two minor children.

JUDGE LONG: Two minor children. All right. And

1	how much did you rent the room out for? Do you recall?
2	MRS. VENEGAS: Yes. I believe that we rented the
3	room out for \$800 a month.
4	JUDGE LONG: And I'm assuming that included
5	utilities?
6	MRS. VENEGAS: Everything. Yes.
7	JUDGE LONG: All right. FTB, do you have any
8	questions for Mr. and Mrs. Venegas related to the
9	testimony they've offered?
10	MR. SMITH: I do not.
11	JUDGE LONG: All right. Thank you, Mr. and
12	Mrs. Venegas.
13	We're going to go ahead and let FTB begin their
14	case presentation.
15	FTB, you may begin whenever you're ready.
16	MR. SMITH: Thank you.
17	
18	PRESENTATION
19	MR. SMITH: Good morning. My name is Joel Smith.
20	I'm Respondent Franchise Tax Board.
21	The primary issue is whether Appellant
22	demonstrated error in Respondent's proposed assessment for
23	the 2019 tax year, and a related issue, depending on how
24	the OTA handles the first issue, is whether Appellant
25	demonstrated reasonable cause to abate a delinquent filing

penalty.

2.4

The relevant facts as they have been presented to this point -- a lot of new information came out in Appellants' oral argument just now. But up until this point, relevant facts were very straightforward.

Appellant did not file a 2019 tax return. Respondent did receive information that indicated Appellant made mortgage interest payments for 2019 that totaled \$12,349. So based on that, Respondent issued a proposed assessment. The information that Respondent relied on for calculating the estimated income is provided in Respondent's Exhibit D, which is a summary of income studies related to mortgage interest paid. And then from that point on, Appellant has not provided any documentation to support the position that there's no filing requirement.

With regard to Issue No. 1, whether Appellant has established error in the proposed assessment, Revenue & Taxation Code Section 19087 provides Respondent with the authority to propose an assessment from any available information which indicates that a taxpayer has a filing requirement. Respondent must establish that the assessment is reasonable and rational. And this is done by introducing evidence linking Appellant with the unreported income. As stated, the income is based on mortgage interest paid reported on IRS Form 1098. This is

provided in Exhibit A.

2.4

The OTA and its predecessor the BOE have held that this is a reasonable and rational estimate of income source. So the next step is that the presumption of correctness places the burden on Appellant to show error in the assessment by a preponderance of the evidence.

Unsupported assertions are not sufficient to satisfy this burden and failure to produce evidence that's within Appellants' control gives rise to a presumption that such evidence is unfavorable to Appellants' case.

Now, as it relates to the information that's just been shared today, if Appellant has some documentation to support these alternative sources of income, Respondent would review it. I point the parties to Exhibit F, which was a letter the FTB sent during the protest process requesting some financial documentation to show how Appellant survived financially through 2019 despite not having employment. Sounds like there were some alternate ways -- sources of income outside of W-2 employment that Appellant relied on.

There may still be a filing requirement as it relates to the rental income that was received. But if there is documentation to support Appellants' arguments today, Respondent would certainly review that. That documentation could include a tax return that shows what

income was received. Absent this documentation, Appellant does not meet the burden to show error in the assessment. So in the event that no documentation is provided, we can discuss -- when my presentation is over -- if there's an ability for OTA to hold the record open. Respondent would certainly be amenable to that.

2.1

2.4

Absent additional documents, the second issue is delinquent filing penalty imposition if this penalty is presumed proper, unless Appellant shows its failure to timely file is a result of reasonable cause and not willful neglect. Again, just as with the first, there has been no documentation or argument to support abatement of this penalty, though, it sounds like there may be documentation that would support it. In the event that the assessment is adjusted, the delinquent filing penalty would be adjusted accordingly.

So, in conclusion, based on California law and the evidence in the record, Respondent requests you sustain its position.

I am available for questions at this time. Thank you.

JUDGE LONG: All right. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

So I'd like to ask Mr. Smith to confirm. It sounds like FTB's position may change if Mr. and Mrs. Venegas are able to provide documentation to support

1 the testimony that they have offered here today; is that 2 correct? 3 MR. SMITH: Yes, that's correct. JUDGE LONG: All right. Mr. and Mrs. Venegas, 4 5 are you prepared to provide additional documentation to 6 Franchise Tax Board to support what you've testified to 7 here today? 8 MRS. VENEGAS: We have a few questions. 9 assume -- we -- I understood a lot of what was said, but a 10 lot of it I didn't comprehend. 11 JUDGE LONG: All right. Let me see 12 if I can break this down. 13 MRS. VENEGAS: Okay. 14 JUDGE LONG: So FTB got information that you made 15 these mortgage payments, so FTB estimated that you had 16 FTB sent letters to you asking for you to file a 17 And when they didn't hear anything back, they 18 issued an assessment. So the information that you're 19 providing FTB today was new to them. And if you can 20 provide anything to substantiate or support that, FTB may 2.1 be willing to revise its assessment. 22 So what they are looking for, it sounds like, 23 would be a 2019 return. May I ask, Mr. and Mrs. Venegas, 2.4 do you normally file a joint return?

MRS. VENEGAS: Yes.

25

JUDGE LONG: All right. So what it sounds like
FTB might be looking for from you is information, such as
if you were fill out a 2019 tax return or if you could
provide any information. And if you look at the
information that was sent to you by Franchise Tax Board,
the Exhibit B or request for tax return, includes a list
of filing requirements, which includes that for a married
filing jointly couple of taxpayers with two or more
dependents, you have a filing requirement if you have -let's see -- California gross income equal to or greater
than \$58,535. Based on your testimony here today, it
sounds like that was not the case?

2.1

2.4

MRS. VENEGAS: Perhaps. We don't believe that we met --

JUDGE LONG: You didn't make more than \$58,000 in 2019.

MRS. VENEGAS: We didn't.

JUDGE LONG: All right. So I think where we're at this point is that it sounds like it might be a good idea for Mr. Smith and for Appellants to perhaps meet and confer, perhaps a phone call or some email exchanges, to see if there is additional documentation. OTA can facilitate that. However, we ask the parties to participate and cooperate in discovery purposes, rather than going through our office. But if it's necessary, we

can arrange to have that evidentiary process take place through our office. But if you're able to provide documentation to support your testimony, it looks like FTB is very interested in hearing and seeing that documentation. So, to that extent, let me go ahead and ask Mr. and Mrs. Venegas, do you have any additional questions for me today?

2.4

MRS. VENEGAS: Yes. We did not respond in the beginning to Mr. Smith, but afterwards we did communicate via email and we did -- I did send -- Fernando and I sent a letter to Mr. Smith that stated -- a written document stating what we stated now just a few moments ago with the exception of not including the details that we had rented a room. I don't believe it might have included those details. But that reinstatement does not make any difference? That's a question.

JUDGE LONG: Well, let me ask.

Mr. Smith, did you receive that information, that letter from Appellants?

MR. SMITH: No. I have no record of receiving anything from Appellants, which is not a problem moving forward. But no, I have not received that.

MRS. VENEGAS: So I -- I do have -- I do have a copy of that letter. I have a packet that was sent. I

don't know if was from Mr. Smith directly or from his offices, but within that packet there's a copy of that statement that I made. I don't have it available with me because what I'm using right now is an Android tablet.

But I would -- I can definitely provide a copy of that if it makes any difference.

2.1

2.4

But if not, the second -- the second thing is -- or the second detail is that we had -- when we received that letter that we responded to with a mailed statement from Mr. Joel Smith, we took that letter to our CPA who does our annual tax returns, and we asked him what does this mean? Do we need to respond to that? But maybe it -- we really did base ourselves on what our CPA's answer was. And what his answer was, we did not need to file because there was no employment on Fernando's behalf.

Now, if our CPA was wrong and he didn't -- and directed us incorrectly, then we did not know. That being that Fernando and I are not CPAs, we don't know the regulations of annual tax returns. And we did not know that he, Fernando, would have needed to file a tax return being unemployed the entire year of 2019.

So the third detail is that because Fernando was unemployed, our oldest son who is an adult and was an adult in 2018 and '19 and was working in 2018 and '19, he -- he filed his taxes, and he put myself and his two

1 brothers and sisters as his dependents because he was 2 helping us financially during that time of -- the ending 3 of the last quarter of 2019. He helped us a lot those first few months that -- in October, November, December. 4 5 We did not have any savings to fall back on when 6 I was diagnosed and couldn't go back to work, and he lost 7 his job. And so our son came in to kind of rescue us. is that a question for our CPA to answer what do we do, or 8 is that -- I mean we don't --10 JUDGE LONG: All right. I'd like just to confirm 11 my understanding. It sounds like you have -- so -- you 12 had 2019, you said earlier you had two dependent children. 13 And this is an additional child who is not dependent on 14 you? 15 MR. VENEGAS: Yes. 16 MRS. VENEGAS: This third child is a nondependent because he's an adult. 17 18 JUDGE LONG: And you said that he claimed your 19 two children as dependents on his return? 20 MRS. VENEGAS: Yes. 21 JUDGE LONG: Did he claim both of you as 22 dependents on his return? 23 MRS. VENEGAS: No. I don't -- and I don't know if 2.4 he was able to claim me or not. I'm -- I don't remember 25 at this time, but I do remember --

need to do at this point in the case, it sounds like there's some communication that needs to happen so that FTB has an opportunity to revise its position. And also so that OTA can have documentation to support our opinion. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to conclude the hearing, but I'm going to keep the record open in this case.

And what that means is that I am going to send out a request for additional information. And when you get that, I'm going to ask you to respond by the date that it says there with whatever documentation you have. So everything you need is going to be in that letter. So that is what I'm going to do to hopefully facilitate a resolution in this case.

So do we have any questions from either party before I conclude the hearing?

MRS. VENEGAS: No.

2.4

JUDGE LONG: No. All right.

FTB, questions?

MR. SMITH: No questions.

JUDGE LONG: All right. Thank you.

Well that concludes the hearing. I will decide this case based on the documents and testimony presented.

And I will maintain the -- I will keep the record open for

additional briefing in this matter. That concludes our hearing, and let's see. OTA will reconvene in 15 minutes for our next case on the morning calendar. We thank everyone for your participation today. Thank you. (Proceedings adjourned at 10:04 a.m.)

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

25