

## 1 CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

## 2 APPEALS DIVISION BOARD HEARING SUMMARY

3 In the Matter of the Petition for Redetermination )  
 4 Under the Sales and Use Tax Law of: )  
 5 EREN NIAZI ) Account Number SR GH 53-004475  
 6 Petitioner ) Case ID 482301  
 ) San Jose, Santa Clara County

7 Type of Liability: Responsible person liability

8 Liability period: 10/01/06 – 06/22/07

9 Item Disputed Amount

10 Responsible person liability \$298,092

11 Tax as determined and protested \$259,804.35

12 Interest through 01/31/13 119,705.57

13 Late payment penalties 17,721.54

14 Failure to file penalty 20,565.80

15 Total tax, interest, and penalty \$417,797.26

16 Monthly interest beginning 02/01/13 \$ 1,299.02

## 17 UNRESOLVED ISSUES

18 **Issue 1:** Whether petitioner is personally liable as a responsible person for the unpaid liabilities  
 19 of Open Source Systems, Inc. pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 6829. We conclude  
 20 petitioner is personally liable.

21 Open Source Systems, Inc. (Open Source) (SR GH 100-196196) was a retailer of server storage  
 22 media from October 2002 until June 22, 2007. Open Source filed for Chapter 7 bankruptcy on July 3,  
 23 2007, and a final decree was entered into on March 25, 2009. At the time its business terminated,  
 24 Open Source had unpaid liabilities related to a Notice of Determination and two returns filed with  
 25 partial remittance. The Sales and Use Tax Department (Department) concluded that petitioner was  
 26 personally responsible for Open Source's sales and use tax compliance pursuant to section 6829.<sup>1</sup>

27 <sup>1</sup> The Department also issued a determination to James Lyle Anderson (SR GH 53-004476), and he filed a timely petition  
 28 for redetermination (Case ID 485900). We recommended that his appeal be granted, and that recommendation was  
 approved by the Board when the matter was presented on the Sales and Use Tax Matters – Consent Calendar on  
 February 28, 2012. The Department also considered issuing determinations for personal liability against Jeremy Streig and  
 Ivan Sacoquin, but it found that they were not responsible for Open Source's sales and use tax compliance during the  
 relevant periods.

1           Petitioner concedes that Open Source's business operations terminated in June 2007, and he  
2 stated on a questionnaire that Open Source collected sales tax reimbursement with respect to its retail  
3 sales. Also, Open Source reported purchases subject to use tax on the two returns that it filed with  
4 partial remittance, which clearly shows that Open Source consumed tangible personal property and did  
5 not pay the use tax. However, petitioner disputes two of the four conditions for imposing personal  
6 liability pursuant to section 6829, that he was a responsible person and that he willfully failed to pay or  
7 to cause to be paid taxes due from Open Source.

8           Petitioner was Open Source's Chief Executive Officer (CEO). The Department concluded that  
9 he was a responsible person under section 6829 because he signed various documents related to sales  
10 and use tax matters and corporate matters as president or CEO of Open Source, and he was listed in the  
11 Secretary of State records as Open Source's CEO, secretary, director, and agent for service of process.  
12 The Department also determined that taxpayer willfully failed to pay, or to cause to be paid, Open  
13 Source's tax liabilities because Open Source had funds available at the time the taxes became due and  
14 chose to pay other creditors.

15           Petitioner contends that he is not personally liable for Open Source's unpaid tax liabilities  
16 because he was not a responsible person within the meaning of section 6829. Specifically, petitioner  
17 asserts that he lacked authority to sign Open Source's checks and that Open Source had a Chief  
18 Financial Officer, internal accounting department, and outside accountants who were responsible for  
19 preparation and submission of all required tax returns and payments. Petitioner states that his duties  
20 related to technical innovations rather than sales and use tax matters. In addition, petitioner claims that  
21 Open Source's secured lender instituted a lock box security system that required that all payments on  
22 accounts receivable be mailed to the lender.

23           The evidence shows that petitioner was Open Source's CEO/president beginning as early as  
24 March 20, 2003, and there is no indication that petitioner's role as CEO ceased before the business  
25 operations terminated (e.g., petitioner signed Open Source's seller's permit application in 2003 and a  
26 waiver of limitation form in August 2006, both as its CEO/president). Generally, a president and CEO  
27 is presumed to have broad implied and actual authority to do all acts customarily connected with the  
28 business, including ensuring its compliance with the Sales and use Tax Law. Petitioner has provided

1 no documentation to support his assertions that he lacked authority to sign Open Source's checks or  
2 that the secured lender required all payments on accounts receivable be sent to the lender, or any other  
3 evidence to show that his authority as CEO was limited. Further, in documents filed with the  
4 bankruptcy court, petitioner was identified as CEO and owner of 100 percent of the corporate stock, as  
5 well as the corporation's "responsible individual." Thus, we find that petitioner was a responsible  
6 person as defined by section 6829 during the period at issue.

7 Personal liability can be imposed on a responsible person under section 6829 only if that person  
8 willfully failed to pay or to cause to be paid taxes due from the corporation, which means that the  
9 failure was the result of an intentional, conscious, and voluntary course of action (even if without a bad  
10 purpose or evil motive). A person is regarded as having willfully failed to pay taxes, or to cause them  
11 to be paid, where he or she had knowledge that the taxes were not being paid and had the authority to  
12 pay taxes or cause them to be paid, but failed to do so.

13 Although petitioner did not sign the sales and use tax returns, as Open Source's president and  
14 CEO, petitioner should have received the determination issued to Open Source, as well as the  
15 Demands for Immediate Payment related to the amounts due on the returns filed with partial  
16 remittance. Therefore, based on the evidence that is available, we conclude that petitioner was aware  
17 of the unpaid tax liabilities.

18 Willfulness also requires that the responsible person must have been able to pay, or cause to be  
19 paid, the taxes when due. Although petitioner asserts that Open Source's Chief Financial Officer and  
20 accountants were responsible for preparation and submission of all required tax returns and payments,  
21 we find that, as CEO with 100 percent stock ownership, petitioner had authority over those individuals.  
22 Petitioner's designation of authority over the sales and use tax matters to other employees does not  
23 alleviate his ultimate responsibility for Open Source's sales and use tax compliance. Regarding  
24 whether Open Source had sufficient funds to pay the taxes due, we note that a list of payments filed  
25 with the bankruptcy court shows Open Source made payments to various creditors totaling about  
26 \$1.3 million from March 14, 2007, through June 6, 2007. Also, two employees have stated that they  
27 received wages during the relevant period. Thus, we find that funds were available to pay the sales tax  
28 liability, but Open Source's management chose to pay other creditors instead. In summary, we

1 conclude that all conditions have been satisfied for imposing personal liability on petitioner under  
2 section 6829 for the outstanding tax liabilities of Open Source.

3 **Issue 2:** Whether petitioner has established reasonable cause sufficient for relieving the late-  
4 payment and failure-to-file penalties originally assessed against Open Source. We conclude that he  
5 has not.

6 While there is no basis under section 6829 for relieving the responsible person of penalties  
7 imposed on the corporation, if the corporation were relieved of the penalties, that relief also inures to  
8 the benefit of the responsible person. Here, petitioner submitted a request for relief of the penalties,  
9 signed under penalty perjury, but the grounds for relief simply reiterate petitioner's contention that he  
10 should not be held personally liable as opposed to stating a basis for relieving Open Source of the  
11 penalties. Accordingly, we conclude that there is no basis for relieving Open Source of the penalties.

12 **OTHER MATTERS**

13 None.

14  
15 Summary prepared by Deborah A. Cumins, Business Taxes Specialist III  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28