BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ΙN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF,)			
)			
J.	GRE	CO,)	OTA	NO.	230412982
)			
				A.	PPELLAN'	Γ.)			
)			
)			

TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Wednesday, January 24, 2024

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS					
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
3						
4						
5	TN MILE MAMMED OF MILE ADDEAL OF					
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,) OHA NO. 220412002					
7	J. GRECO,) OTA NO. 230412982)					
8	APPELLANT.)					
9)					
10						
11						
12						
13						
14	Transcript of Electronic Proceedings,					
15	taken in the State of California, commencing					
16	at 1:07 p.m. and concluding at 1:27 p.m. on					
17	Wednesday, January 24, 2024, 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:	ASAF KLETTER
4	For the Appellant:	J. GRECO
5		
6	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD
7		PAIGE CHANG
8		BRAD COUTINHO
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

California; Wednesday, January 24, 2024
1:07 p.m.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

JUDGE KLETTER: Let's go on the record.

This is Appeal of Greco, OTA Case Number

230412982. Today is Wednesday, January 24th, 2022 -
2024. My apologies. And the time is approximately

1:00 p.m.

I am Administrative Law Judge Kletter, and will be conducting this hearing. Also present is our stenographer, Ms. Alonzo, who is reporting this hearing verbatim. To ensure that we have an accurate record, we ask that everyone speak one at a time and does not speak over each other. Please say your name before you speak and try to speak clearly and loudly. And when you are not speaking, please mute your microphone to avoid feedback or background noise. When needed, Ms. Alonzo will stop the hearing process and ask for clarification. After the hearing, Ms. Alonzo will produce the official hearing transcript, which will be available on the Office of Tax Appeals website. The hearing transcript and video recording are part of the public record. This proceeding is a live broadcast and any information shared on your screen is publicly viewable.

The Office of Tax Appeals is not a court. We are

1 an independent appeal body. The Office of Tax Appeals is 2 staffed by tax experts and is independent of the state's 3 tax agencies. If there are any questions during this process or any questions regarding technology, please 4 5 direct them to me. I just ask that you please wait for me 6 to please acknowledge you before you continue with your 7 question. And if you become disconnected or have technical difficulties, please wait and Office of Tax 8 9 Appeals will contact you. 10 Now, on the record, can the parties please each 11 identify yourself by stating your name for the record, 12 beginning with Appellant. 13 MR. GRECO: Yes. This is John Vincent Greco. 14 JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. 15 you. 16 And for Respondent Franchise Tax Board. 17 MS. CHANG: Paige Chang representing THE 18 Franchise Tax Board. Good afternoon. 19 JUDGE KLETTER: Good afternoon. 20 And Mr. Coutinho, if you could just please 2.1 identify yourself for the record. 22 MR. COUTINHO: Brad Coutinho, representing the 23 Franchise Tax Board. 2.4 JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. So for

some background, we met for a prehearing conference to

25

discuss this appeal on December 20th, 2023. We discussed two issues. The first issue is whether Appellant has shown error in Franchise Tax Board's proposed assessment of additional tax for the 2018 tax year; and the second issue is whether Appellant is entitled to interest abatement. OTA also noticed the issue of whether -- because Franchise Tax Board's proposed assessment is based on issuance of an erroneousness refund, if there is any impact on the tax assessment or interest in this appeal.

2.4

The parties were invited to suggest alternative issue statements during their presentation. And my understanding is that off the record there, you know, was some adjustment to the interest. So please mention that during your presentation.

Now with respect to the evidentiary record, the Franchise Tax Board has provided Exhibits A through F with its opening brief and Exhibits G and H in response to the prehearing conference minutes and orders.

Mr. Greco, do you object to those new Exhibits G or H? They were about the refunded amount.

MR. GRECO: No. I do not object. In fact, I actually found them helpful because I was unable to track down that transaction. And they helpfully showed up in the mail detailing exactly what the refund amount was and when it was issued. So, no, I do not object.

1	JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank
2	you, Mr. Greco.
3	I just wanted to confirm with Franchise Tax
4	Board, are there any new exhibits today?
5	MS. CHANG: No new exhibits today. Thank you.
6	This is Paige Chang.
7	JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank
8	you.
9	So Appellant does not object to these Exhibits A
10	through H. Therefore, these exhibits are entered into the
11	record.
12	(Department's Exhibits A-H were received in
13	evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)
14	Now, Appellant provided Exhibits A through C,
15	which I will number 1 through 3, in response to the
16	prehearing conference minutes and orders.
17	Appellant, are there any new exhibits that you
18	wanted to provide or just those three exhibits?
19	MR. GRECO: This is John Greco. I do not have
20	any new exhibits as such, no.
21	JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Franchise
22	Tax Board, do you have any objection to those Exhibits 1
23	through 3?
24	MS. CHANG: This is Paige Chang. No objections
25	at this time. Thank you.

JUDGE KLETTER: Okay. Great. So those
Exhibits 1 through 3 are entered into the record.

(Appellant's Exhibits 1-3 were received

in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)

JUDGE KLETTER: Now, before we go into the presentations, in response to the prehearing conference minutes and orders, Appellant indicated that he would like to testify. Testifying allows the Office of Tax Appeals to accept your statements as evidence to the extent they concern facts of which you have personal knowledge.

So, Mr. Greco, I'd like to swear you in for your testimony. Can you please raise your right hand.

J. GRECO,

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

2.1

2.4

JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank

you. Before I turn it over to you, Mr. Greco, for your

presentation, just as a brief reminder, we have five

minutes for Appellant's presentation, five minutes for the

Franchise Tax Board's presentation, and five minutes for

Appellant to respond to FTB's presentation, provide a

closing statement, and then your rebuttal.

So, Mr. Greco, are you ready to begin your presentation?

MR. GRECO: This is John Greco. I am.

JUDGE KLETTER: Please begin.

2.4

PRESENTATION

MR. GRECO: Okay. Just to recap kind of the basis of this and Exhibits 1 through 3. Exhibit 1 -- and so this is kind of where this thing gets started is this transposed number on Line 14. This is Exhibit 1. So my take on this is, obviously, I have accidentally put \$114,052 as a deduction, when, in fact, it was supposed to just be a carried over zeroed out number. And, in fact, if you go through the rest of the return, it does come out correct as I was treating it as zero. I will also note that there was no schedule C with this. So there's no basis for this \$114,052 deduction. I would have thought that that would have been immediately obvious to anybody reading it.

And then Exhibit 2 or B-2 is showing that the transposed line on Line 14 did not affect the ultimate taxable income entry of \$109,651. And Exhibit C or 3 is the calculated amount due of \$898, which I do not believe is it in dispute. So that's what I sent in. And, apparently, this is -- as I said helpfully said --

Exhibit G on May 14th, 2019, the FTB issued me a refund in the amount of \$2,593.33, well in excess of my original \$898 refund claim.

2.4

And so this is where the problem starts, and this is where the overpayment is, and this is where the interest starts accruing. I -- I did, when I saw this -- let me back up. So, initially, my main focus was to go with the interest. Because, in my opinion, charging interest on a debt that I did not know existed for the better part of what, four years, seemed a little excessive. I'm also contesting any interest from the point of notification on, like, as I'm contesting this. I don't think it's fair that I'm paying interest on the debt continuing until today.

So that was initially my reason for coming was to more go with that. But then when I saw the refund amount and I'm questioning, was my original \$898 deduction ever pulled from that number? Because it looks like they refunded me \$2,593.37, and I'm just wondering where the \$898 refund that I was entitled to, if that's been subtracted from that amount. So I'm wondering if the actual debt isn't \$1,695.37. I don't -- I'm not sure how that calculation was made.

And that's about all I've got.

JUDGE KLETTER: Thank you, Mr. Greco, for your

presentation. Hopefully FTB may be able to answer that during their presentation. They will have five minutes, and I'm holding my questions to the end of the presentation.

Ms. Chang, are you ready to begin?

MS. CHANG: This is Paige Chang. Yes, I'm ready.

JUDGE KLETTER: Please go ahead.

2.1

2.4

PRESENTATION

MS. CHANG: Good afternoon. My name is Paige Chang, along with my co-Counsel Brad Coutinho, representing the Franchise Tax Board.

The issues on appeal are first, whether Appellant has met his burden of proof to establish error in FTB's proposed assessment; and second, whether Appellant is entitled to interest abatement. Additionally, the Office of Tax Appeals is considering whether the issue of interest is affected by FTB's proposed assessment being based on an erroneous refund.

Regarding the issue of interest first, FTB has revised its position to abate interest for the period of April 15th, 2019, until November 14th, 2022. Because the May 2019 refund is considered an erroneous refund, the Notice of Proposed Assessment, which was issued on October 14th, 2022, is deemed the erroneous refund letter,

the document in which FTB demanded repayment of the erroneous refund from Appellant.

2.4

And because no interest is charged if the refund returned within 30 days from the date of the erroneous refund letter, FTB has abated interest until 30 days after the date of the NPA, November 14th, 2022. Thus, the correct amount on appeal is additional tax in the amount of \$2,676 and accrued interest from the date of November 14th, 2022, until today. FTB has also prepared a computation of the interest.

With regard to the remaining period of accrued interest, Appellant has not established any basis to abate the remaining interest, and FTB cannot abate any additional interest. Regarding the proposed assessment, Appellant has not met his burden of proof to establish error in the proposed assessment for the 2018 tax year. Here, Appellant erroneously reported California substractions on Line 14 of his return. Because Appellant filed his return as a California resident, and wage income is included in the calculation of taxable income, it was an error to enter any amount on Line 14. Thus, FTB's proposed assessment disallowing the subtraction is correct.

Appellant explains that the subtraction was a transposition error and does not appear to dispute the

amount of tax owed. Although, I will go over the proposed assessment in the Notice of Action in response to Appellant's question in his presentation. So the amount on the return that was due a refund is a calculation from the total tax. The amount of total tax reported on Appellant's return is \$6,966, which is the same amount of total tax shown on the Notice of Action. And the reason that that comes out to a refund of around \$2,000 is that there were withholding credits. And this is shown on the Notice of Action, which is Exhibit E, I believe. And so there were additional withholding credits as well as interest added to the computation. And so then the math comes out to the \$2,676 amount. FTB is happy to answer questions about that issue as well.

2.4

In conclusion, because Appellant has not established error in FTB's proposed assessment, nor established a basis to abate interest beyond the interest abatement period from April 15th, 2019, until November 14th, 2022, Respondent's action should be sustained.

Thank you. I'm happy to answer any questions.

JUDGE KLETTER: Thank you, Ms. Chang. This is

Judge Kletter. I just have a quick question in regards to
the interest. You mentioned that a computation was
prepared. So the interest that is accrued from

November 22nd, 2022, do you know how much the amount of interest is as of today?

MS. CHANG: Yes. This is Paige Chang speaking. The interest computation was calculated until January the 19th, so I don't have it until exactly today, but until January 19th, is \$187.07.

JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Thank you for that.

Now, I'd like to turn it over to Mr. Greco.

Mr. Greco, would you like to make a final statement, a rebuttal to what Ms. Chang said, or is there anything else that you've prepared or would like to say in your closing statement?

2.1

2.4

CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. GRECO: This is John Greco. I would point out the referenced notice date of October 14th, 2022. That was an initial assessment that I received with a total additional tax and interest figure of an eye-popping \$7,927.37. So that's the initial notice on October 14th that I received. I then contacted and disputed it at that time, and I got a new assessment on February 28th, 2023, which is where we come up with the new and current number. So I would say that if we are going to calculate interest from a notice of proposed amount, it should be based on

the current proposed amount and not the one that was sent out in October. That's a small point and small dollar amount, I'm sure.

2.1

2.4

I'm still not understanding, I guess, how if I paid \$7,451 for the tax year of 2019 and my total tax due was \$6,996, I'm not understanding still where that -- where that \$800 refund went. And it doesn't seem that it's being subtracted from the erroneously issued return, I guess. I guess I'm still a little confused on that. But other than that, I do not have anything further.

MR. COUTINHO: Judge Kletter, can I respond to Appellant's question?

JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. Please,
Mr. Coutinho.

MR. COUTINHO: This is Brad Coutinho with the Franchise Tax Board. Attached to Respondent's opening brief, Exhibit C, there's a notice of intercepted funds notice. And it appears that \$980 was intercepted and sent to another agency. I don't want to get into too many specifics during the oral hearing, but if you need any other information, please let me know. Thank you.

MR. GRECO: This is John Greco. Thank you. Thank you. That is correct, and I had forgotten about that. Thank you.

JUDGE KLETTER: This is Judge Kletter. I'd like

to thank the parties for their presentations today. This concludes our hearing. And the case will be decided, and our written decision will be issued no later than 100 days from today. The case is submitted, and the record is now closed, and this concludes this hearing session. Thank you so much, everyone. (Proceedings adjourned at 1:27 p.m.)