BEFORE	THE	OFFICE	OF	TAX	APPEALS
--------	-----	--------	----	-----	---------

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

)

)

) )

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF, )

T. JONES and J. JONES, ) OTA NO. 230112315

APPELLANT. )

TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Wednesday, November 15, 2023

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS 1 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 3 4 5 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF, ) 6 ) ) OTA NO. 230112315 T. JONES and J. JONES, 7 ) APPELLANT. ) 8 ) 9 10 11 12 13 14 Transcript of Electronic Proceedings, 15 taken in the State of California, commencing at 9:30 a.m. and concluding at 9:39 a.m. on 16 17 Wednesday, November 15, 2023, reported by 18 Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter, in and 19 for the State of California. 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 2	APPEARANCES:	
2	Ndministrative Isr. Tudes.	
3		JUDGE LAUREN KATAGIHARA
4	Maministrative law budge.	
5	For the Appellant:	WILLIAM FRIEDRICHSEN
6	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
7		FRANCHISE TAX BOARD
8		ERIC BROWN MARIA BROSTERHOUS
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
L		OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS

Г

1	<u>index</u>
2	
3	PRESENTATION
4	PAGE
5	By Mr. Friedrichsen 7
6	By Mr. Brown 8
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS

Г

1 California; Wednesday, November 15, 2023 2 9:30 a.m. 3 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: We're opening the record in 4 5 Appeal of Jones before the Office of Tax Appeals. This is 6 OTA Case No. 230112315. Today is Wednesday, 7 November 15th, 2023. The time is 9:30 a.m. We're holding this hearing electronically with the agreement of all the 8 9 parties. 10 I'd like to begin by asking the parties to please 11 identify themselves by stating their name for the record. 12 Let's begin with Appellant. 13 MR. FRIEDRICHSEN: Bill Friedrichsen. 14 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: And who is here for 15 Respondent? 16 MR. BROWN: Eric Brown, California Franchise Tax 17 Board. 18 MS. BROSTERHOUS: And Maria Brosterhous. 19 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: Thank you. 20 I am Judge Lauren Katagihara the Administrative 21 Law Judge who will be hearing and deciding this case. 22 Today we're considering the following two issues: 23 One, whether Appellants have established that the 2.4 underpayment of estimated tax penalty should be abated; 25 and two, whether Appellants have established a basis upon

1 which interest can be abated.

2	At the prehearing conference, Respondent
3	confirmed that it does not dispute Appellants' assertion
4	that they made estimated tax payments totaling \$11,800
5	towards the 2021 tax year, and that that amount is
6	143 percent more than Appellants' tax liability for the
7	2020 tax year.
8	Respondent has proposed Exhibits A through E.
9	Appellants have not proposed any exhibits.
10	Appellant, as you indicated that you'll be
11	referring to Respondent's exhibits today, I assume that
12	you do not have any objections to Respondent's exhibits;
13	is that correct?
14	MR. FRIEDRICHSEN: That is correct.
15	JUDGE KATAGIHARA: Thank you.
16	The parties did not identify any witnesses prior
17	to the October 31st, deadline, so there will not be any
18	testimony offered for this case. And with that, I think
19	we're ready to begin the presentations.
20	Appellant, you have the floor for the next ten
21	minutes.
22	MR. FRIEDRICHSEN: I won't need ten minutes.
23	It's a very simple ask on our part.
24	///
25	///

1	PRESENTATION
2	MR. FRIEDRICHSEN: The primary drive of taxable
3	income in the State of California comes from the operation
4	of a subchapter S corporation owned by Mr. and Mrs. Jones.
5	We did not we were unable to complete the S
6	corporation's tax return for this tax year until sometime
7	in March of the following year. Yet, the Franchise Tax
8	Board rules clearly states that if your taxable income is
9	over a certain floor amount you have to pay in a
10	certain 100 percent or some 90 percent of the estimated
11	tax liability for the tax year in question.
12	I guess our response is we had no idea what the
13	tax liability or even the taxable income was for that year
14	until we were able to complete the underlying tax returns
15	two months after the due date of the estimate payment.
16	And so we made a good-faith payment to try to cover our
17	underpayment by paying in excess of the previous year's
18	tax and then hoping that we could get some relief on that
19	basis because we had other reasonable basis to make a
20	different estimate payment at the time in January. That's
21	basically the question.
22	I'm reasonably sure Mr. Brown and I have
23	talked before. I'm reasonably sure that I'm not going to
24	come out on top in this one just because the rules are the
25	rules. And there doesn't appear to be underlying

٦

1 equitable allowance in a situation such as ours where 2 taxable income changes so drastically from one year to the 3 next and -- and asking us to make estimate payments on unknown numbers. It does not seem to be equitable to the 4 5 taxpayer. 6 And that's my case. I mean, it's -- I'm going 7 for a mercy judgment here. 8 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: Okay. Thank you, 9 Mr. Friedrichsen. I may have questions for you, but if I 10 do, I'll wait to ask them until after Respondent's 11 presentation. 12 Respondent, you may proceed with your presentation. You have ten minutes. 13 14 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Judge. 15 16 PRESENTATION 17 Good morning. I'm Eric Brown, Tax MR. BROWN: 18 Counsel with the Franchise Tax Board. And with me today 19 is Maria Brosterhous, also from the Franchise Tax Board. 20 In the present appeal, Appellants have failed to 21 show error in the Franchise Tax Board's imposition of the 22 underpayment of estimated tax penalty for the 2021 tax 23 year, and Appellants have also failed to show any reason 2.4 why interest should be abated. 25 Appellants are Colorado residents who filed a

1 California nonresident income tax return. For the 2021 2 tax year, Appellants reported over a million dollars 3 California adjusted gross income, over a million dollars California taxable income, and \$110,925 total tax, and a 4 5 balance of \$99,125. They paid only \$11,800 in estimated 6 tax payments over the year, which represented a 7 significant underpayment of the estimated tax payment obligation. 8

9 In their return, Appellants did not self-report 10 or self-assess an underpayment of estimated tax penalty. 11 The FTB subsequently sent a notice to Appellants in which 12 FTB imposed an estimated tax penalty. Appellants argue the estimated tax penalty should be abated because they 13 14 paid the minimum required under the law based on their 15 interpretation of federal law, which provides a safe 16 harbor provision where a taxpayer pays estimated tax for 17 the year in an aggregate amount that is greater than 100 18 percent of the preceding taxable year.

However, while California conforms to most of the federal law regarding the estimated tax penalty, California expressly does not conform to the safe harbor provision where the taxpayers report California adjusted gross income over a million dollars. Because taxpayers reported over a million dollars California AGI, the safe harbor provision does not apply to them. As previously

1 discussed, Appellants were required to pay at least 90 percent of their current i.e. 2021 tax year, and their 2 3 \$11,800 total estimated tax payments was just over ten percent of their estimated tax payment obligation. 4 5 Appellants state they are unfamiliar with 6 California law and implied that they should receive 7 leniency or sympathetic treatment. However, unfamiliarity with the law is not an excuse for noncompliance with the 8 9 law, and unfamiliarity is not a basis for relief. 10 Appellants have not argued any reason for abatement of 11 interest. Under the law, interest can only be abated if 12 there is an unreasonable error or delay by an officer or 13 employee of the Franchise Tax Board acting in his or her 14 official capacity in performing a ministerial or 15 managerial act. In the present appeal, Appellants have 16 not argued any unreasonable error or delay by any officer or employee of the FTB, nor in the performance of a 17 18 ministerial or managerial act. 19 I will be happy to respond to any questions the 20 Panel may have. 21 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: Thank you very much for your 22 presentation. 23 Appellant, before we move on to your closing 2.4 statements, if you would like to provide one, I do have a 25 few questions. It does sound like you do not dispute that

the penalty amount was properly calculated or imposed; is 1 that correct? 2 3 MR. FRIEDRICHSEN: I'm sorry. Could you say that 4 again? 5 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: Is there any dispute as to whether the penalty amount was properly calculated or 6 7 imposed? MR. FRIEDRICHSEN: No, none whatsoever. 8 9 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: And did the Appellants retire 10 or become disabled during the year 2020 or 2021? MR. FRIEDRICHSEN: They did not. 11 12 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: Thank you. Those are the only questions I have. Would you like to provide a rebuttal 13 14 and closing argument? 15 MR. FRIEDRICHSEN: No. The position is the same 16 as stated. We were asked to make an estimated payment 17 based on an unknown number and don't feel that that's an 18 equitable approach to enforcing tax estimated payments. 19 But rules are rules. 20 JUDGE KATAGIHARA: Thank you, Mr. Friedrichsen. 21 I don't have any further questions for either 22 party, so we can conclude this hearing. 23 I want to thank both parties for their 2.4 presentations today. This appeal will be decided based on 25 the evidence presented. The record is now closed, and the

1	case will be submitted today, which means that OTA will
2	send both parties my written decision no later than
3	100 days from today.
4	OTA will take a recess before the next hearing,
5	and everyone may now exit the hearing.
6	Thank you.
7	(Proceedings adjourned at 9:39 a.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS 12

1	HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter in and for
4	the State of California, do hereby certify:
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 1st day
15	of December, 2023.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	