# BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ΙN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF,	)		
S.	S. ADAMYAN,					) ) OTA NO. )	230713953 230914357		
				A.	PPELLAN'	Г.	)		
							)		

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Cerritos, California

Tuesday, September 10, 2024

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	TN MUE MAMMED OF MUE ADDEAL OF
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF, )
7	S. ADAMYAN, ) OTA NO. 230713953 )
8	APPELLANT. )
9	)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Transcript of Proceedings, taken
15	at 12900 Park Plaza Drive, Suite 300,
16	Cerritos, California, 90703, commencing
17	at 2:59 p.m. and concluding at 4:12 p.m.
18	on Tuesday, September 10, 2024, reported
19	by Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter,
20	in and for the State of California.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Panel Lead:	ALJ TERESA STANLEY
4	Panel Members:	H.O. KIMBERLY WILSON
5	ranei membeis.	ALJ EDDY Y. H. LAM
6	For the Appellant:	S. ADAMYAN
7		
8	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD
9		ERIC BROWN JACKIE ZUMAETA
10		01101122 201212111
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 into evidence at page 6.)					
6						
7	(Appellant's Exhibits 4-5 were received into evidence at page 12.)					
8	(Department's Exhibits A-J were received into evidence at page 13.)					
9						
10	OPENING STATEMENT					
11						
12	<u>PAGE</u>					
13	By Ms. Adamyan 14					
14	By Mr. Brown 34					
15						
16	CLOSING STATEMENT					
17						
18	<u>PAGE</u>					
19	By Ms. Adamyan 38					
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

1 Cerritos, California; Tuesday, September 10, 2024 2:59 p.m. 2 3 JUDGE STANLEY: We'll go on the record in the 4 5 Appeals of Adamyan, Case Number 230713953. The date is 6 September 10th, 2024. The time is 2:59 p.m., and we're in 7 Cerritos, California. 8 Once again, I'm Judge Teresa Stanley, and with me 9 is Hearing Officer Kim Wilson and Judge Eddy Lam. 10 Please identify yourselves and who you represent, 11 and I'm going to start with the Appellant. 12 MS. ADAMYAN: Susan Adamyan. I represent myself. 13 JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you. 14 And Franchise Tax Board. 15 MR. BROWN: Eric Brown, California Franchise Tax 16 Board. 17 MS. ZUMAETA: Jackie Zumaeta, Franchise Tax 18 Board. 19 JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you. 20 Just some preliminary matters, the Office of Tax 2.1 Appeals is independent of the California Franchise Tax 22 Board and any other tax agency. We are not a court, but 23 we are an independent appeals agency that is staffed with 2.4 its own tax experts. The only evidence that we have in 25 the Office of Tax Appeals record is what was submitted by

the parties in this appeal. These proceedings will be live streamed and will be posted on OTA's YouTube channel. So be careful not to share personal information.

The issues, as we discussed at the prehearing conference, are whether Appellant has established error in the Franchise Tax Board's denial of claims for refund for taxable years 2020, 2021, and 2022. And the second issue is whether the Office of Tax Appeals should impose a frivolous appeal penalty.

Ms. Adamyan, do you agree that those are the issues here today?

MS. ADAMYAN: Yes.

2.4

JUDGE STANLEY: And Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. For exhibits, prior to the prehearing conference, Appellant submitted an amended California resident income tax return in substitute forms W-2, which would be Form 3525 for the three taxable years at issue, which OTA marked as Exhibit 1 for taxable year 2020, Exhibit 2 for taxable year 2021, and Exhibit 3 for taxable year 2022. Franchise Tax Board did not object and those exhibits are admitted into evidence.

(Appellant's Exhibits #1-3 were received in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)

JUDGE STANLEY: Since the prehearing conference,

1 Appellant has submitted objections to Respondent's opening brief on August 21st, 2024, and the same title document 2 3 here today. 4 Ms. Adamyan, are they the same? Is that the same 5 packet of documents? 6 MS. ADAMYAN: It has very slight changes because 7 I wanted it to stay within my timeline. So majority of it, it is exactly the same. Very few highlights that I 8 9 have to adjust, again, to stay within my timeline that I 10 was given. 11 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. 12 This is Judge Lam speaking. JUDGE LAM: Adamyan, can you speak closer to the microphone. I can't 13 14 really hear you. Thank you. 15 MS. ADAMYAN: Can you hear me now? 16 JUDGE LAM: Yes. 17 MS. ADAMYAN: Okay. Thank you. 18 JUDGE STANLEY. Okay. So you just left some 19 things out of the second packet that were in the original 20 one in order to save time? 2.1 MS. ADAMYAN: I actually made sure that I'm more 22 in line just not to have too much, you know, outside. 23 I -- I just stayed focused to the main points, and I adjusted my time, like I said, to stay within 45 minutes. 2.4 25 With that, I had additional information since the time

that I send my -- send in my first copy. I also added 1 2 that portion that I, you know, received additional 3 information. JUDGE STANLEY: Can you identify which portion 4 that would be? 5 6 MS. ADAMYAN: Yes. That portion is under Number 7 5 where it says, "Respondent's Position." This is where I -- Appellant's position. This is where I had additional 8 9 information I brought to your attention from IRS, just 10 FYI. 11 JUDGE STANLEY: So that's on page 2? 12 MS. ADAMYAN: On page 4. Page 4 on the bottom section. 13 14 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. And the things that you 15 added here are just your -- it looks like they're just 16 your arguments against -- that Franchise Tax Board is 17 saying; is that correct? 18 It -- it does, you know, matter to MS. ADAMYAN: 19 this case. And since that information came to me later 20 on, I thought it was important to bring it to your 2.1 attention. 22 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. First, I'm going to turn 23 to Mr. Brown and ask if the Franchise Tax Board has any 2.4 objections to what was submitted by the deadline in the --

noted in the Minutes and Orders or to the -- what is a

25

little bit revised edition of that.

2.1

2.4

MR. BROWN: Well, I -- I do object on behalf of FTB because this is -- really, I didn't -- there aren't any objections in per se to any exhibits that FTB present in -- in its Minutes and Orders and previously in its briefing. This is all really consists of new -- of just argument, and briefing had been closed a long time before this had been submitted.

JUDGE STANLEY: So would the Franchise Tax Board object to accepting it as additional argument?

MR. BROWN: We haven't had an opportunity to address it, to review it and write -- I mean, to address it if we did have any -- any counter arguments to it.

MS. ZUMAETA: Judge Stanley, I think to the extent that OTA wanted to accept that as an additional briefing document, then we would ask for additional time to also be able to provide a reply to that document.

JUDGE STANLEY: Can you give me a minute.

MS. ADAMYAN: If I may address, it's not an additional document to this case. It's just additional information I did receive from IRS, and I thought it was important just to showcase the information that I received.

JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. And what we're talking about is here's -- that when we refer to exhibits, that's

the documentary evidence.

2.4

MS. ADAMYAN: Correct.

JUDGE STANLEY: When you get new information from the IRS, those are statements of law, which is argument. So there -- the Franchise Tax Board is concerned about what kind of arguments you're making that are new that they haven't been able to address.

MS. ADAMYAN: I'm not making any arguments based on that. It's just simply stating I just received this additional letter. That's all. It's not an argument that I'm presenting, but I will cover all of the FTB's exhibits as we discussed during our prehearing conference.

JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. Just one minute. Okay.

I'm sorry. I'm having a technical issue. I can't get

connected to the internet, so I need to take a five-minute

recess.

(There is a pause in the proceedings.)

JUDGE STANLEY: All right. Let's go back on the record in the Appeals of Adamyan case and -- okay. When Ms. Alonzo is ready. And thank you for your patience.

While we were indisposed, we took the time to discuss the proposed additional documentation.

And what we'd like to do, Ms. Adamyan, is not accept this last document that you sent us today as evidence here. But you may feel free, in your testimony,

to address whatever you want in here. And if you need extra time to do it, we're okay to give you extra time because we don't have a hearing following this one. So you'll be testifying under oath or affirmation. So anything you say can be taken as evidence, if it's testimony as to facts. Okay.

MS. ADAMYAN: Okay.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE STANLEY: Do you have any continuing objection, if you can address the Franchise Tax Board's briefing? Do you have any continuing objection to their opening brief, or just the contents of it?

MS. ADAMYAN: I would like to address, just like we discussed. I thought that's what I'm her for to address all of their exhibits and to showcase why I do not agree with their statements.

JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. Okay. Okay. So we're not going to admit that, but we're going to allow time to address anything that's in this document that you want to address. So when the original document was submitted timely there were three new exhibits attached to the brief, a copy of U.S. Treasury check for taxable year '23, dated, August 26th, 2024. I've marked that as Exhibit 4. And there was a seller's final settlement statement dated, November 25th, 2020, showing real estate withholding of \$17,703 paid to the Franchise Tax Board. I've marked that

as Exhibit 5. And there was a one page of an unidentified 1 2 tax return showing claimed real estate withholding of 3 \$17,703. Mr. Brown, did the Franchise Tax Board receive 4 that document with those attachments? 5 6 MR. BROWN: We did receive those. 7 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. And do you object to admitting those into evidence? 8 9 MR. BROWN: Yes, on grounds that they're not 10 relevant. JUDGE STANLEY: Grounds of irrelevance? 11 12 MR. BROWN: Correct. 13 JUDGE STANLEY: So in general, I -- without 14 Ms. Adamyan testifying, I don't know that they don't have any relevance. One of the items is related to the IRS, 15 16 not to the Franchise Tax Board, and is for taxable year 17 outside of the taxable years at issue here, but perhaps 18 she has a way of tying it in. So I'm going to go ahead 19 and accept Exhibits 4, 5 and 6 into evidence. And 20 we'll -- we'll consider them. You know, we'll give them 21 the weight that they deserve if there's relevance to them. 22 (Appellant's Exhibits 4-5 were received 23 in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 2.4 MR. BROWN: Judge Stanley, may I ask also if 25 there's -- if we would have an opportunity to address

1 these new exhibits in writing, because we haven't had a --2 we hadn't -- we had seen them before. But, again, the 3 time for briefing had closed by the time we had received these. So I would like to, if they are going to be 4 5 considered, I'd like to give an opportunity to discuss our -- our points in writing. 6 7 JUDGE STANLEY: Well, they were submitted by the deadline in the Minutes and Orders, those additional 8 9 And so why don't you reserve that request and see 10 what the testimony is and see if you have a response today 11 or if you really would like additional time. 12 MR. BROWN: Thank you. 13 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. FTB submitted Exhibits A 14 through J, and Appellant had requested time to file objections, if any, to Franchise Tax Board's exhibits. 15 16 The document that was submitted does not include 17 objections to Franchise Tax Board's exhibits, so I'm going 18 to admit those into evidence as well. 19 (Department's Exhibits A-J were received in 20 evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 21 JUDGE STANLEY: So today, Ms. Adamyan, you said 22 you were going to testify. Can you please raise your 23 right hand. /// 2.4 25 ///

#### S. ADAMYAN,

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

JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you.

And just to be fair, only people who are testifying as to facts are sworn in as witnesses. Franchise Tax Board is only arguing facts, they're not testifying, so they're not sworn in. Okay. We had initially given you 45 minutes, but as I said today, we're willing to give you more if you need it. So you may proceed when ready.

MS. ADAMYAN: Thank you.

2.1

2.4

### PRESENTATION

MS. ADAMYAN: Statement of facts: May 20th,
2023, I, Susan Adamyan Appellant, submitted an amended
return for the year 2020, return 540 Schedule X. I also
submitted on May 22nd, 2023, amended return for the year
of 2021, 2022, 540 Schedule X. For the purpose of covering
all basis, I'm citing both RTC and IRC statutes as
Respondent often cites. Also, to address the assertion
from FTB that California FTB is not interconnected to the
Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Services, I

provide you with the following facts:

2.1

2.4

Fact No. 1, when submitting any California 540 tax return, it is determined that a federal 1040 return is required.

Fact No. 2, federal adjusted gross income is reflected on Line 13 of the California Form 540. That amount is taken from federal Form 1040, Line 37. If you please see Exhibit A on page 10, Line 13, it clearly states, enter federal adjusted gross income from federal Form 1040. It is impossible to use a different AGI amount on the 540 than the one calculated and used on 1040 or for the same tax year. So as you can see the Franchise Tax Board is undoubtedly interconnected to Internal Revenue Services.

Fact No. 3, state wages from the federal -- from your federal. This is given on 540, Line 12, but it's not used in subsequent calculation in determining the final tax due or tax overpayment. Relevant calculations use Line 13 federal AGI.

Fact No. 4, as stated in the California Revenue & Taxation Code gross income, adjusted gross income, and taxable income are as defined by IRC section 61, 62, 63.

According to California Revenue & Taxation Code 17071,

17072, 17073, it states -- if you take a look at Exhibit B on page 11, California code RTC directs to section 61 of

the Internal Revenue Code. Same thing goes for 17072(a). Please take a look at Exhibit 12, section C. California Code RTC directs to section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code. Same thing is also true for 17073(a). Please take a look at Exhibit D, page 13. California Code RTC directs to section 63 of the Internal Revenue Code.

2.1

2.4

Fact No. 3, IRS honored my 1040 return for the 2023 tax year and has processed a refund. Please take a look at Exhibit E, page 14, the top portion of this exhibit. I included the actual letter I received from IRS that says, "We found an error on your 2023 Form 1040, which effects the following areas of your return. We changed the amount claimed as federal income tax withhold on your tax return." In the highlighted area of the dollar amount, you can clearly see \$7,551 was returned to me, plus interest of \$192.19. The below is the actual copy of the check of \$7,743.19.

This on its own should be good enough proof for my case as IRS refunded my overpayment by making zero dollar amount on the Form 1040, Line 37. That means there is no amount to be transferred to California RTC 540, Line 13. However, I will go on to address the Respondent's erroneous exhibits.

No. 2, Respondent's position regarding their Exhibit A, Exhibit B, Exhibit C. Respondent pointing to

the overpayment via escrow, \$28,380, and Franchise Tax
Board's returned portion of it, \$18,847. Appellant's
position, I paid \$17,703 in advance withheld from escrow.
Please take a look at Exhibit F-1 on page 15. This is the
actual escrow document. And on the bottom where I
highlighted the withhold -- tax withhold to Franchise Tax
Board, \$17,703.

2.1

On my 2020 tax return later on that year, my total payment were \$28,380. There is still an overpayment of \$9,533 that I have not yet received. Please take a look at Exhibit F-2 on page 16. On Line 48, it shows that I paid \$9,533. On page 73, it shows \$17,703 that escrow sent directly to Franchise Tax Board. And on Line 78, it shows \$28,380 of total payment.

I also -- also please see statement of rebuttal that I submitted with my 2020 return to correct incorrectly reported trade or business activities. Please take a look at Exhibit F-3 on page 17, statement to correct incorrectly reported Form 4797, Sell of Business Property. Also please see IRC 1221, Capital Asset Define A in General. Please take a look at Exhibit F-4 on page 18, and I highlight it.

No. 3, Respondent's position regarding Exhibit D and I, quote, "On June 13, 2023, Appellant resubmitted the previously submitted amended 2020 California resident

income tax return. However, she included other documents with her tax return, including correspondence, as well as selected documents purporting to represent her amended federal income tax return," end quote.

2.1

2.4

Appellant's position, documents of federal amended 2020 return were submitted as per your instructions on Franchise Tax Board website. I presented document to rebut and correct erroneous forms of payments known to have been submitted to IRS and Franchise Tax Board by the parties identified on documents.

And the following are what I submitted: Letter of explanation, two pages; Form 540 California Plus Schedule X 2020, 6 pages; original tax return, 11 pages from original tax return explaining all changes made attaching forms and schedules; Form 3525, 1 page to correct incorrectly reported W-2; statement to correct California adjustment resident schedule, no trade or business activities, 1 page; statements from to -- statements form to correct incorrectly reported 1099, 4 pages; additionally, 2-page copy of federal Form 1040 X; and one federal Form 4852 were attached, including with 18 pages of federal original tax return explaining all changes made attaching forms and schedules. Again, I followed the process from Franchise Tax Board's website on how to rebut and correct past tax returns.

No. 4, Respondent's position regarding Exhibit E 1 2 and I, quote, "Appellant's gross income is subject to 3 taxation under Section 17071 and IRC section 61, section 17071 states that IRC Section 61 relating to gross 4 5 income shall apply unless otherwise specified," end quote. 6 Appellant's position on gross income, RTC 17071 section 61 7 and 26 IRC 3401(c), 7701 Title 26 regarding IRC section 61. It would suffice to show what it cannot mean. 8 The Supreme Court has repeatedly stated that the income 10 tax is not and cannot be an unapportioned direct tax. 11 Please see United States Court versus Union Pacific in 12 1916, Stanton versus Baltic Mining Company in 1916, and Peck versus Lowes in 1918, such that and I, quote, "The 13 14 income tax is, therefore, not a tax on income as such. Ιt 15 is an excise tax with respect to certain activities and 16 privileges, which is measured by reference to the income 17 which they produce. The income is not the subject of the 18 It is the basis for determining the amount of tax," tax. 19 end quote. 20

Congressional records proceeding and debates of 78th Congress, March 2nd, 1943, to April 5th, 1943. It can be clearly shown that Congress has never meant for the income tax to be a direct tax. Section 61 is derived from the Revenue Act of 1928, which had the benefit of The Classification Act of 1923. The first item listed in

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

section 61 is compensation for services. When the meaning of the term "compensation and services", as well as then "position and employee", and substituted -- are substituted from The Classification Act, compensation for services has virtually identical meaning to wages as defined in IRC section 3401(a) and 3121(a). That is under the principle of ejusdem generis. Please see United States Supreme Court Circuit City Stores versus Adams in 2001 and Norfolk and Western Company versus Train Dispatchers in 1991.

2.4

The following items in section 61 would likewise be inherently restricted to sources of income derived from federal privileges and thus, an excise tax, not a direct tax. As to the items of income I declared on my original return, I had received Form 1099s for the payers or entities. Making those payments, I included those Form 1099s with my return. According to the directions of the use of the Form 1099, this form is only to be used by a trade or business, performing the function of public office. Please see IRC Section 770126.

No. 5, Respondent's position regarding Exhibit F, Exhibit G, Exhibit H. And I, quote, "Appellant's attempt at substitution of FTB Form 3525 for her W-2 to reflect zero wages is based on position identified and rejected as frivolous. The term "employee and wages" as used in

Internal Revenue Code apply to all employees, unless specifically exempted by the Internal Revenue Code," quote.

2.1

2.4

Appellant's position, I asked for FTB to honor and stand beyond their own statement above due to, in fact, to the Respondent's point above, the IRS exempted my 2023 tax returns and refunded my overpayment stating I did not make wages, income, or taxable income. In addition, I just received a letter from the IRS stating they are in process of correcting my 2020 tax returns, and that I shall be expecting a refund in four to six weeks. As they already refunded my 2023 overpayment and in process of refunding my 2020 overpayment based on the same facts I am providing to you today. I'm certain they will also honor my 2021 and 2022 as the FTB should as well.

Since individual does not necessarily mean natural person, and I quote from Black's Dictionary of Law, 2nd edition. As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group of class and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership corporation or association. But it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper classes, include artificial persons," again, end quote; Black's Dictionary of Law, 2nd

edition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

And since Congress must be taken to have made the change deliberately, I, quote, "Where Congress includes particular language in one section of the statute but omits it in another, it is generally presumed that Congress acts intentionally and purposely in the disparate inclusion or exclusion," end quote. Please see United States case Russello versus United States in 1983. Under the doctrine that the 1954 code is itself the law, it must be presumed that natural persons are no longer included when the term "person" is used therein. I am in fact a natural living being. Thus, if the contention that the IRC of 1954 is now the law is allowed to stand and without regards to any other consideration, I am not within the class of any person, either for purpose of the summons authority or any other provision of Internal Revenue or Franchise legislation.

Wages -- oh, one second. I lost one page. Excuse me. One second.

JUDGE STANLEY: You skipped page 5, if that's what you're looking for.

MS. ADAMYAN: I skipped -- I skipped page 5. I think -- oh, gosh. Okay. Thank you. Sorry about that. My apologies.

Revenue & Taxation Code section 17071, 17072, and

others, and per the statutory language behind IRC
Section 3401(a), 3401(c), 770110, and others I, quote, "On
behalf of the government, it is urged that taxation is a
particular matter and concern itself with the substance of
the thing upon which the tax is imposed, rather than with
legal forms of expression. But the statutes levying
taxes, the literal meaning of the word employed is most
important, for such statutes are not to be extended by
implication beyond the clear import of the language used.
If the words are doubtful, the doubt must be resolved
against the government and in favor of the taxpayer," end
quote. Please see Gould versus Gould, 245 US 151, 153.

2.4

A term of art is a legal term that is defined in the law itself. Such terms must be -- must be understood in their legal sense and not their dictionary meanings. There are some examples of income tax terms of art:

United States, states, U.S. person, wages, employees, employer, trade or business, taxpayer, includes including, and many more. These are some of the ordinary words, but each of those has a specific definition provided within the tax code itself, and which the defense -- differs from the ordinary dictionary meaning. They become legal terms of art.

For example, the term "United States," please see Exhibit 19 on -- I mean Exhibit G on page 19. The term

"United States," when used in a geographical sense, 1 includes only the state and the District of Columbia. 2 3 Term "state" -- same exhibit on page 19 -- according to 7701(10), and I, quote, "The term 'state' shall be 4 5 construed to include the District of Columbia." The term "person," Section 19, Section 17021, please see Exhibit H 6 7 on page 20. 2023 California Code, Revenue & Taxation Code, 8 9 RTC, General Provisions, No. 19, and I, quote, "Person 10 includes any person, firm, partnership, general partner of 11 the partnership, limited liability company, registered 12 liability partnership, foreign limited liability partnership, association, corporation, company, syndicate, 13 14 estate, trust --15 JUDGE STANLEY: Ms. Adamyan. 16 MS. ADAMYAN: Yes. 17 JUDGE STANLEY: I'm sorry to stop you. Can you 18 start that No. 19 over because you started talking 19 superfast, and our stenographer can't keep up. 20 MS. ADAMYAN: I'm sorry. 2.1 No. 19, quote, "Person includes any person, firm, 22 partnership, general partner of a partnership, limited 23 liability company, registered limited liability

partnership, foreign limited liability partnership,

association, corporation, company, syndicate, estate,

2.4

25

trust, business trust, or organization of any kind. As used in Division 2 commencing with Section 6001, person shall include, in addition to the terms of definition contained in the first sentence, trustee, trustee in bankruptcy, receiver, executor, administrator, or assignee.

2.1

2.4

"The term person shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company, or corporation." This is according to IRC of 1954, 1986 26 IRC, and 7701(a)(1). Since individual does not necessarily mean natural person, and I, quote -- or I think you went through this. Yeah I covered this portion.

Term "wages" according to 3401(a) remuneration of any kind, and by any name, including salary, fee, paid to any employee and to others in position in the federal, civil, or military services. The term "employee" 3401(c), please see Exhibit I, page 21. And I, quote, "For purpose of this chapter, the term "employee" includes an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, estate, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing. The term "employee" also includes an officer of corporation.

The term "employer", according to 3401(b), same

exhibit, page 21. For the purpose of this chapter, the term "employee" means the person for whom an individual performs or perform any services of whatever nature as the employee of such person except that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

Forgive me for one more second. My pages are running away from me today. I apologize.

The term "trade or business," according to 26 IRC 7701, please take a look at Exhibit J, page 22. And I, quote, "The term 'trade or business' includes the performance of the functions of a public office." term "taxpayer," according to RTC 17004, please take a look at Exhibit K, page 43. Quote, "Taxpayer includes any individual, fiduciary, estate, or trust subject to any tax imposed by this part or any partnership." The term "includes and including," according to Black's Law Dictionary, 6th edition. Please take a look at Exhibit L, page 24. In light of the basic legal principle of Black's Law Dictionary, page 763, the inclusion of one is the exclusion of another. The certain destination of one person is an absolute exclusion of all others. doctrine decrees that where law expressly describes a particular situation to which it shall apply, an irrefutable inference must be drawn that what is omitted or excluded was intended to be omitted or excluded.

No. 6, Respondent's position regarding Exhibit G,

Exhibit H, and I, quote, "Universal Media" -- I mean, "NBC Universal Media LLC indicated that its business is entertainment. Accordingly, Appellant's argument that neither she nor her employer is engaged in a trade or business within the meaning of the federal or California law," end quote.

2.1

2.4

Appellant's position, No. 1, that is correct.

NBC Universal Media is an entertainment company, and, in fact, no way is connected to federal or any government entity or in any trade or business within the meaning of federal or California law.

No. 2, in fact, we are under a strict regulation. I must take a mandatory anticorruption annual test and swear under oath that I am not connected or engaged with any government office or entity. Please see Exhibit M, pages 25, 26, 27, 28, and I will address them all separately regarding mandatory compliance training. If you take a look at page 25, the top portion is an email that I received from my management on compliance training; and it states, "As a company this mandatory training is a must for all to complete."

The bottom portion I just included because the whole -- the entire training was two-hour long. I just bring you some examples of two highlighted areas of risk.

If Kate is working with a government official, that is

absolutely no-no for us. If Kate is working with a consultant and the consultant happens to be working with the government official, again, that is absolutely against the compliance training ruling.

2.4

On page 26, here's another example. Kate is being asked to offer an internship to return -- I mean, to return for a meeting -- in return for a meeting with a government official, what should Kate do? If we happen to answer option No. 1, which states, Kate should agree to give the government official's nephew a company internship because it's not considered a bribe if no cash is paid. That is absolutely against our compliance.

If we happen to answer No. 2, which states Kate should agree to give the government official's nephew a company internship out of respect for the other country's cultural norms, again, that would be against our compliance. Number three is the only option that is correct. Kate should report the government official's request and the consultant's advice to the compliance professional in her legal department and ask for help on how to proceed.

After two hours of training and many information given to us at the end, we are provided with this to be specific what qualifies government official, as well as what qualifies government entity. Under government

official: No. 1, any elected, appointed or nominated officer or official; No. 2, declare candidate for public office; no. 3, officer, employee, or other person acting as a representative of any government entity; no. 4, representative of judicial body; No. 5, royal family.

2.1

2.4

Under government entity, any government agency, department, board instrumentally, or commission, including judicial authority; No. 2, any government owned or government controlled entity; No. 3, government association, organization, or businesses; No. 4, public international organizations; No. 5, political parties. If after all this we're still not sure, we are asked -- ask compliance if you are unsure of anyone if they are government official or government entity.

And page 28, this is a portion of a consent form with my testimony I have to submit that I'm not connected to any government agency. And one area that I highlighted, "Are you currently a government employee, or elected or appointed public official, or a candidate for a national state or local public office? Or have you been nominated by a government official to hold position of any kind?" The definition of public office is interpreted broadly and includes, but not limited to, school boards, local government, counsels, and all other governmental offices and positions.

The legal fact of the matter is that if the enterprise that I -- hired me has no connection to the federal government in some privileged way, and if other of my earnings also have no connection to the federal government, then I'm not obligated by law to pay any tax -- I mean, to pay tax no matter how much I'm earning. The basic law of the land holds your private property as sacrosanct, and the most important property right you have is to determine for yourself who you are and what you are. That encompasses the right to sell your labor in order to make a living. No one can tax you for doing that. That's because you own yourself and have an unabridged right to enter or not into a contract.

2.4

No. 3, regarding third-party W-2 information return form. In determining that my W-2 private sector payments, the Form 3525 I presented to rebut and correct an erroneous amounts originally shown as income, I mistakenly reported the private sector pay I received in 2020, 2021, 2022 as income from taxable federal activities as defined, as stated above by applicable tax law when, in fact, it was not. None of the payments I received were connected in any way to a trade or business federal or federally connected, or otherwise constitute capital gain, profit, or income within the meaning of relevant law.

If the information return W-2 filed by a third

party to the relationship between the Franchise Tax Board and the taxpayer, which reported income as that third party believes it to be, the IRC makes it clear that a form W-2 is not the final word or what a taxpayer's taxable income is as provided in 26 USC 6201(d). And I, quote, "In any court proceedings, if a taxpayer asserts a reasonable dispute with respect to any item of income report -- reported on -- reported on an information return field with the Secretary under subpart (b) or(c), or part three of subchapter (a) of Chapter 61 by a third party, and the taxpayer has fully cooperated with the Secretary, including providing, within a reasonable period of time, access to and inspection of all witnesses, information, and documents within the control of the taxpayer's responsibly requested by the Secretary. Then the Secretary shall have the burden of producing reasonable -reasonable and probative information concerning such deficiency, in addition to such information return," end quote.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

Prove that my private sector payments are connected to federal or federally connected privileges. Petitioner saw that form W-2 had been erroneously issued. Erroneously indicating that payments were made to me in the course of a trade or business, and that I may have been guilty of a felony by acting though I were a federal

officer or employee. According to 18 USC 192, officer or employee of the United States, and I, quote, "Whoever falsely assumes or pretends to be an officer or employee acting under the authority of the United States or in any department, agency or officer thereof, and acts as such, or in such pretend character demands or obtains any money, paper, document, or things of value, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both," end quote.

2.4

Again, I am not an officer of a United States corporation, or in the armed forces, or an employee with any of the above mentioned entities, or an elected official. I do not perform the functions of a public servant office of the United States, District of Columbia, or any agency, or instrumentally of either during 2020, 2021, 2022, or through the present for that matter. If the federal income tax does not apply to my private sector payments, then neither does state income tax.

I am in a nonfederally connected private sector work arrangement, an entirely private agreement to trade my personally owned skills, time, and effort for some of the other parties supply of negotiable IOUs, which can be in any form other than money.

In conclusion and prayer, I, Susan Adamyan,
Appellant prays this Honorable Court to honor the RTC and

1 IRC statutes I brought to your attention; grant my 2 overpayment and refund for 2020, 2021, and 2022 tax years, 3 which I, Appellant, am justly entitled. Also as mentioned above, the IRS honored my 1040 return 2023 refund based on 4 5 the same information I'm bringing to your attention. 6 I appreciate your time. 7 JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you, Ms. Adamyan. I'm going to turn to my Panel to see if they 8 9 have any questions of you at this -- oh, wait. First, let 10 me turn to Mr. Brown and see if the Franchise Tax Board 11 has any questions for you. 12 Did you have your microphone on? 13 MR. BROWN: We have no questions at this time. 14 JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you. 15 Judge Lam, do you have any questions? 16 JUDGE LAM: I have no questions at this time. 17 Thank you. 18 And, Hearing Officer Wilson, do JUDGE STANLEY: 19 you have any questions? 20 HEARING OFFICER WILSON: No questions. Thank 2.1 you. 22 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. I don't have any questions 23 either at this time. So I'll turn to Mr. Brown for 2.4 Franchise Tax Board's presentation. You may begin when 25 you're ready.

#### PRESENTATION

2.4

MR. BROWN: Good afternoon. I'm Eric Brown, attorney for the Franchise Tax Board. Also appearing for the Franchise Tax Board is Jackie Zumaeta.

In the present appeal, Appellant has failed to show error in the Franchise Tax Board's denial of her claims for refund for any of the tax years in issue, FTB's denials for each year were in response to Appellant's frivolous amended tax returns. For tax years 2020, 2021, and 2022, Appellant filed timely valid California income tax returns in which she reported accurate values for wages, taxable income, and taxes. In May of 2023, Appellant filed amended tax returns for each year, which were frivolous zero returns in which she claims zero wages, zero taxable income and zero tax liability, while claiming a refund of all of the taxes withheld by her employer, or for which she paid for the entire year.

In the amended returns, Appellant explained the changes and her reasons for filing an amended return were because she was not paid wages in any year as that term is defined in the Internal Revenue Code. Appellant's arguments have been consistently and emphatically rejected by the Office of Tax Appeals, State Board of Equalization, the Appellate Courts, the IRS, who have all found the arguments to be frivolous and without any merit.

In its Minutes and Orders, the OTA encouraged the parties to review the 2018 OTA precedential opinion of Appeal of Balch, in which the OTA, again, rejected the argument that the Balch Appellant did not receive wages and that wage income was not taxable. reemphasized that the argument was frivolous and rejected it in its entirety. Also, in the Appeal of Balch, the OTA imposed a frivolous appeal penalty on the Appellant.

In the present appeal, Appellant's arguments are identical to those presented in Appeal of Balch and warrant the OTA's emphatic rejection. In its August 8, 2023, and September 20, 2023 letters in which the OTA acknowledged Appellant's appeals, the OTA also advised Appellant that continuing her arguments might result in an imposition of a frivolous appeal penalty. Because Appellant's arguments are clearly frivolous and because Appellant received prior notice of imposition of the frivolous appeal penalty, Respondent believes an imposition of the penalty is appropriate in the present appeal.

I would be happy to respond to any questions.

JUDGE STANLEY: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Ms. Adamyan's presentation, she did state her opinion as to what the relevance of those Exhibits 4, 5, and 6 were. Do you have any response to what she said?

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

MR. BROWN: Exhibits 4, 5, and 6 from which document or brief?

2.4

JUDGE STANLEY: So Exhibit 4 was the copy of the U.S. Treasury check for taxable year 2023, and she explained why she thinks she should get a refund in this case because the IRS refunded her for 2023. And then she talked about the seller -- Exhibit 5, seller's financial statement showing real estate withholdings of \$17,703. And I believe she was expressing that capital gains are also not taxable to her. And then the one -- Exhibit 6 was one page of an unidentified tax return. It doesn't show the year, but it shows claimed real estate withholding of \$17,703. Do you have any responses to her arguments with respect to those?

MR. BROWN: I can address those issues. Number one, the letter from the IRS and the check from the IRS are both for tax year 2023 and don't have any relevance to any of the tax years in question. To the extent, perhaps she's arguing that — that they may show a similar validation of whatever her position is, there's simply no evidence to demonstrate that. There's no foundation for any — or for that assumption.

Regarding -- regarding the next page, which I see is Exhibit F-1, that's a settlement statement of the escrow that resulted in tax withholding of \$17,703. And I

see that is reported accurately on page -- or the next 1 2 page, Exhibit F-2 on Line 73, which indicated that that 3 was a withholding. That means that it was a payment. It's reported under the section marked "payments," as was 4 5 the California tax or income tax withheld of \$10,677. 6 added together the sum is \$28,380. 7 She calculated her taxes on that same form on Line 65 at \$9,533. And as we indicated, we refunded 8 9 \$18,000 -- I forget the exact number. But those numbers 10 were -- were computed accurately and -- just a moment. 11 MS. ZUMAETA: Judge Stanley, I think to the 12 extent that your question was asking do we continue to have an objection to the relevance of those documents, I 13 14 think we maintain that they're not relevant, but we 15 withdraw our objection on those. 16 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. Thank, you, Ms. Zumaeta. 17 Judge Lam, do you have any questions for the 18 Franchise Tax Board? 19 JUDGE LAM: No questions. Thank you. 20 JUDGE STANLEY: Hearing Officer Wilson, do you 2.1 have any questions for FTB? 22 HEARING OFFICER WILSON: I do. I'm not sure if 23 you had a chance, but is there a transcript for this 2023 2.4 tax year that show the change? Or --

MR. BROWN: No, we don't have an account

25

1	transcript for 2023. Again, it's it's not a tax year
2	at issue in this in this proceeding.
3	HEARING OFFICER WILSON: And along the same
4	lines, is there a transcript for the tax years at issue
5	that shows a change?
6	MR. BROWN: The was no yes. The answer is we
7	do have accountant transcripts, even current ones that
8	we we obtained last month, and there are no changes in
9	the transcripts for 2020, 2021, and 2022.
10	HEARING OFFICER WILSON: Great. Thank you.
11	JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. And the only follow-up
12	question I would have, Mr. Brown, is, even if the IRS did
13	accept zero returns from Appellant, does that effect
14	Franchise Tax Board's position?
15	MR. BROWN: What would effect Franchise Tax
16	Board's position is if there were any changes. However,
17	the transcripts all indicate there were no changes.
18	JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. Thank you.
19	Ms. Adamyan, I'm going to turn back to you and
20	give you a chance to have a final rebuttal and respond to
21	anything that the Franchise Tax Board said.
22	MS. ADAMYAN: Thank you. I appreciate that.
23	
24	CLOSING STATEMENT
25	MS. ADAMYAN: All I'm hearing is I'm here with so

1 many facts and proofs from the actual law from both FTB 2 and IRS, and the only thing I'm hearing back is everything 3 is rejected because it's frivolous. However, when you look at the definition of frivolous, I was not late. I 4 5 was not trying not to pay any taxes, and that is the definition of being frivolous. I'm not hearing any 6 7 specific law or arguments against what information I 8 brought to you today. JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. Thank you. 10 Judge Lam, do you have any final questions? 11 JUDGE LAM: No questions. Thank you. 12 JUDGE STANLEY: And Hearing Officer Wilson? 13 HEARING OFFICER WILSON: No. Thank you. 14 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. Then this concludes our 15 hearing. I thank you all for participating. 16 Mr. Brown, just to make clear, the Franchise Tax 17 Board is not requesting any additional time to hold the 18 record open for briefing; correct? 19 MR. BROWN: That is correct. That is correct. 20 JUDGE STANLEY: Okay. Okay. So this hearing is 2.1 concluded. The record is now closed, and the matter is 22 submitted for deliberation. 23 The Panel will meet to jointly deliberate and 2.4 decide the appeal, and the Office of Tax Appeals will mail

a written opinion no later than 100 days from today.

25

I want to thank you for participating, and we're going to adjourn and reconvene tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. (Proceedings adjourned at 4:12 p.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 taken before me at the time and place set forth, that the 6 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 30th day 15 of September, 2024. 16 17 18 19 ERNALYN M. ALONZO 20 HEARING REPORTER 21 2.2 23 2.4 25