# BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,	)
	)
WILLIFORD COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES, L.P.,	) OTA NO. 230312/0/
ш.г.,	)
APPELLANT.	)
	)

TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Wednesday, June 19, 2024

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	TN MIE MAMMED OF MIE ADDEAL OF
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF, )  OUR NO. 220212707
7	WILLIFORD COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES, ) OTA NO. 230312707 L.P.,
8	APPELLANT. )
9	)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Transcript of Electronic Proceedings,
15	taken in the State of California, commencing
16	at 9:30 a.m. and concluding at 9:47 a.m. on
17	Wednesday, June 19, 2024, reported by
18	Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter, in and
19	for the State of California.
20	Tot one sease of outflorning.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:		
2			
3	Administrative Law Judge:	JUDGE KEITH LONG	
4	For the Appellant:	R. WILLIFORD	
5	TOT the Appellant.	L. CARL-OLIVER AUDREY HORNING	
6		AUDICET HORNING	
7	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD	
8		LEOANGELO CRISTOBAL BRAD COUTINHO	
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1		I N D E X		
2				
3		<u>EXHIBITS</u>		
4				
5	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-3 were received into evidence at			
6	page 9.)			
7	(Department's Exhibits A-I were received into evidence at page 8.)			
8				
9		PRESENTATION		
10		DACE		
11		PAGE		
12	By Ms. Carl-Oliver	9		
13	By Mr. Cristobal	11		
14				
15		WITNESS TESTIMONY		
16		DA GE		
17		PAGE		
18	By Ms. Horning	10		
19		CLOCING CHARRING		
20		CLOSING STATEMENT		
21		<u>PAGE</u>		
22	By Ms. Carl-Oliver	14		
23	By Ms. Horning	14		
24				
25				

California; Wednesday, June 19, 2024 9:30 a.m.

2.4

JUDGE LONG: We're opening the record in the appeal of Williford Commercial Properties, LP. The OTA Case Number is 230312707. This matter is being held before the Office of Tax Appeals. Today's date is June 19th, 2023. The time is approximately 9:30 a.m. This hearing is being held electronically with the agreement of both the taxpayer and the agencies' representatives.

Today's hearing is being heard and decided by a single Administrative Law Judge under the Office of Tax Appeals Small Case Program. The Office of Tax Appeals is an independent and neutral agency. It is not a Tax Court. My name is Keith Long, and I will be conducting the hearing and deciding the appeal.

Also present is a stenographer who is reporting this hearing verbatim. To ensure we have an accurate record, we ask that everyone speak one at a time and does not speak over each other. Also, speak clearly and loudly. 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.

2.4

I'd like to make a few reminders to help the process run as smoothly as possible. First, please ensure your microphone is not muted when you speak, otherwise your voice will not be picked up on the live stream even though we can hear you in the room. On the other hand, please make sure that your microphone is muted when you are not speaking. This will help avoid feedback issues. You do need to speak into the mic for it to pick up on our live stream. And as a reminder, these proceedings are being broadcast live, and anything said today and any information shared today is publicly viewable on the live stream.

For the record, will the parties please state their name and who they represent, starting with the representatives for the Franchise Tax Board.

MR. CRISTOBAL: Hello this is Leo Cristobal representing the Franchise Tax Board.

MR. COUTINHO: Good morning. This is Brad Coutinho, also representing Respondent Franchise Tax Board.

MS. CARL-OLIVER: This is Laurie Carl-Oliver.

I'm representing Roger Williford, one of the partners of Williford Commercial Properties.

MR. WILLIFORD: I'm Roger Williford with

1 Williford Commercial Properties. 2 MS. HORNING: This is Audrey Horning, CPA for 3 Williford Commercial Properties. JUDGE LONG: 4 Thank you. At the prehearing conference, Appellant indicated 5 that they may wish to provide witness testimony. 6 7 that we're joined here today by Ms. Horning. At the prehearing conference, there were no objections to this 8 9 testimony. 10 I just want to confirm with Franchise Tax Board 11 that there are no objections at this time. 12 MR. CRISTOBAL: This is Leo Cristobal. Correct. 13 No objections. 14 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 15 As background information, witness testimony is 16 not required in an appeal to OTA. However, testimony 17 given under oath may be considered as evidence. 18 Otherwise, statements made by Appellant are considered to 19 be argument about the case. In addition, when testimony 20 is provided under oath, FTB is given the opportunity to 2.1 cross-examine the witness. 22 Ms. Horning if you please raise your hand. /// 23 /// 2.4 25 ///

#### A. HORNING,

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 LONG: Moving forward, prior to this hearing, FTB submitted an exhibit index identifying Exhibits A through I. At the prehearing conference there were no objections to FTB's exhibits.

Would Appellant please confirm that there are no objections at this time.

You're on mute.

MS. CARL-OLIVER: No objections.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you. Accordingly, FTB's Exhibits A through I are admitted without objection.

(Department's Exhibits A-I were received in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)

JUDGE LONG: Additionally, Appellant previously submitted Exhibit 1, letter from A.M. Horning, CPA, dated April 5th, 2023. FTB did not have any objections to this exhibit. On June 4th, Appellant submitted additional exhibits labeled Exhibit 1 and 2. As there has already been an exhibit labeled Exhibit 1, these new exhibits will be renumbered as Exhibits 2 and 3.

The exhibits are: Exhibit 2, Pandemic Events and

1 Milestones in California; and Exhibit 3, Account Period Summary for Tax Year 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2021, and 2 3 2022. Does Franchise Tax Board have any objections to 4 these exhibits? 5 MR. CRISTOBAL: This is Leo Cristobal for 6 7 Franchise Tax Board. We do not. No objections. 8 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 9 The exhibits summarized above are admitted into 10 the evidentiary record. 11 (Appellant's Exhibits 1-3 were received 12 in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 13 JUDGE LONG: There are two issues in this appeal. 14 They are one, whether late-filing penalty should be 15 abated; and two, whether the per partner late-filing 16 penalty should be abated. 17 This hearing is estimated to take approximately 18 45 minutes, and we will begin with the taxpayer's opening 19 and witness testimony, which is -- should take 20 approximately 15 minutes. 21 Appellant may start when they are ready. 22 23 PRESENTATION 2.4 MS. CARL-OLIVER: Okay. Basically, we -- as we 25 all know, we've just went through a pandemic. And our

businesses, including Audrey's, was shut down for a considerable amount of time for 2020 up through -- I believe based upon new articles that we supplied, it was well into 2022 before it was relieved.

We did pay our 2020 taxes, the \$800 plus some fees, I believe, in April 15th of 2021. And then we did pay the actual late-penalty fee in 2022. Even though we've paid it, we do feel that we should not have to pay it. We did the best that we could. I -- I know Audrey is the person who helps us with our taxes, and that's kind of where we -- where we sit.

JUDGE LONG: Okay. And did you want to present your witness testimony now?

MS. CARL-OLIVER: Audrey, can you tell us what was happening with your business at that time?

2.1

2.4

### WITNESS TESTIMONY

MS. HORNING: Yes. I have an a very small CPA firm with limited staff. And when we had to shut down, we had -- we staggered hours, and we had limited people here. And then we lost staff who -- through regular attrition, plus people didn't want to work in close quarters. So we were not able to replace them.

So we -- we did as much work as we could in our limited time and staffing. And as Laurie said, we did the

1	best we could and filed as quickly as we could once we got
2	everything together. And we still are short staffed, but
3	we're coming out of it.
4	JUDGE LONG: Thank you.
5	Does that conclude your testimony?
6	MS. CARL-OLIVER: I believe so, yes.
7	JUDGE LONG: Okay. Franchise Tax Board, do you
8	have any questions for the witness?
9	MR. CRISTOBAL: This is Leo Cristobal. No. No
10	questions for the witness.
11	JUDGE LONG: Thank you.
12	Okay. We are going to move on then to Franchise
13	Tax Board's opening presentation, if Appellant's
14	presentation is complete.
15	Correct?
16	MS. CARL-OLIVER: Yes.
17	MS. HORNING: Yes.
18	JUDGE LONG: Yes. Okay. Then we will move on to
19	Franchise Tax Board.
20	Franchise Tax Board you have 10 minutes. You may
21	begin when you're ready.
22	
23	PRESENTATION
24	MR. CRISTOBAL: Okay. Good morning. My name is
25	Leo Cristobal, and I represent Respondent Franchise Tax

Board.

2.4

This appeal is for the tax year 2020 and involves the late-filing penalty and per partner late-filing penalty. The issue is whether Appellant has met its burden of proof to show reasonable cause for filing its tax return late. As a partnership, Appellant's 2020 return was due on or before March 15, 2021. However, Appellant did not file its return until September 1st, 2022, which was more than 17 months past this deadline.

When taxpayers fail to timely file their return,
FTB is required to impose a late-filing penalty. FTB must
also impose a per partner late-filing penalty when the
taxpayer is a partnership. When FTB imposes these
penalties, the law presumes the penalties were imposed
correctly. To overcome this presumption, California law
requires the taxpayer to establish that its failure to
file timely was due to reasonable cause and not due to
willful neglect. And ultimately the taxpayer has the
burden of proof to show that reasonable cause exists, and
unsupported assertions are not sufficient to satisfy that
burden of proof.

Here, Appellant contends it had reasonable cause for filing late because it relied on its tax preparer to file its 2020 return. But because there was a change in Appellant's ownership as well as disruptions caused by the

COVID-19 pandemic, Appellant argues that its preparer's ability to timely prepare and file the return -- timely prepare and file the return for Appellant was delayed.

2.4

There's a well-established, bright-line rule stating that taxpayers have a personal nondelegable duty to timely file their tax return. Therefore, notwithstanding a change in ownership or the impact of COVID, failure of an agent, such as the tax preparer, to timely file a return on behalf of Appellant does not constitute reasonable cause. Additionally, to date, Appellant has not provided evidence showing that despite its own best efforts it was personally prevented from honoring the deadline.

And unfortunately, other than citing to the pandemic and providing the letter explaining the efforts made by its taxpayer in the mist of the pandemic,

Appellant has not demonstrated the diligent actions it personally took, if any, to try to comply across the 17-plus months that spanned between the deadline and the day its return was filed.

In conclusion, because Appellant has not met its burden of proof to establish that its failure to timely file was due to reasonable cause, Appellant is not entitled to penalty abatement. Accordingly, FTB's action denying Appellant's refund claim should be sustained.

Thank you. And I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you.

Okay. We will move right along.

Appellant has five minutes to make its final statement and closing, and you may begin when ready.

2.1

2.4

#### CLOSING STATEMENT

MS. CARL-OLIVER: So as you know, these are not past due taxes. They are -- these are just administration fees that are imposed upon the taxpayer. I -- I do understand the need to file timely and that -- we did provide documentation. I -- I don't even believe that the Franchise Tax Board was open during 2021. So unless I'm mistaken, I -- I'm not sure how if you aren't open, how we are supposed to also be open. We were ordered not to work in some cases. I -- so -- I -- we do recognize that we have to pay the \$800 fee, but the late fee and the filing penalty, again, we just feel is burdensome and not fair.

MS. HORNING: I would like to add that this return was on extension. We filed a timely extension. So, in any case, it was not 17 months late. It was less than 12 months late because they had until September 15th to file a return.

MS. CARL-OLIVER: I believe we are done.

1 MS. HORNING: Yes, I'm done. JUDGE LONG: Thank you. Sorry. 2 I was just 3 making sure to write down everything that you had said so that it can be addressed properly in the opinion. Well, 4 5 thank you. I believe we're ready to conclude this hearing. 6 7 This case is submitted on Wednesday, June 19th, 2024. The 8 record is now closed. 9 I want to thank everyone for joining today. 10 OTA will send a written opinion of the decision 11 within 100 days after the record is closed, which is 12 today. 13 Today's hearing in the Appeal of Williford 14 Commercial Properties, LP, is now adjourned. 15 (Proceedings adjourned at 9:47 a.m.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 2.4 25

## 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 5th day 15 of July, 2024. 16 17 18 19 ERNALYN M. ALONZO 20 HEARING REPORTER 21 2.2 23 2.4 25