

1
2
3 **BOARD OF EQUALIZATION**
4 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
5

6 In the Matter of the Appeal of:) **OPINION ON**
7) **PETITION FOR REHEARING**
8)
8 **BENJAMIN R. DU AND**) **2007-SBE-001-A**
9 **CARMELA L. DU**) Case No. 339310
10)
11 _____)

12 Representing the Parties:

13 For Appellant:

Charles P. Rettig

Avram Salkin

Sharyn M. Fisk

16 For Respondent:

Jozel L. Brunett, Tax Counsel

17 Counsel for the Board of Equalization:

Louis A. Ambrose, Tax Counsel

18
19 On July 17, 2007, we issued an opinion in which we held that this Board has no
20 jurisdictional authority to hear and decide appellants' claim for a refund in the amount of \$288,938 for
21 1999. In our opinion, we held that appellants' claim was barred pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code
22 section 19752, subdivision (a)(4), as a condition of appellant's election of the Voluntary Compliance
23 Initiative (VCI) option (Option 1) afforded by that subdivision. Consequently, we concluded that the
24 invalidity of appellants' refund claim precluded the exercise of our jurisdiction to determine the matter.
25 Appellants then filed a petition for rehearing. However, under Revenue and Taxation Code section
26 19334 a petition for rehearing may be properly filed only after a determination of a claim for refund is
27 made by this board. Therefore, consistent with our opinion, we conclude that the petition is invalid and
28 that we may not exercise our jurisdiction to hear and decide it.

Appeal of Benjamin R. Du and Carmela L. Du

1 We further note that even if this board had jurisdiction to hear and decide the petition for
2 rehearing, the grounds set forth therein do not constitute good cause for a new hearing, as required by
3 the *Appeal of Wilson Development, Inc.* (94-SBE-007), decided by this Board on October 5, 1994. In
4 *Appeal of Wilson Development, Inc., supra*, we determined that good cause for a new hearing may be
5 shown where one of the following grounds exists, and the rights of the complaining party are materially
6 affected: 1) irregularity in the proceedings before this Board by which the party was prevented from
7 having a fair consideration of its case; 2) accident or surprise, which ordinary prudence could not have
8 guarded against; 3) newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the petition for rehearing,
9 which the party could not, with reasonable diligence, have discovered and produced prior to our decision
10 of the appeal; 4) insufficiency of the evidence to justify the decision, or the decision is against law; or 5)
11 error in law.

12 In the petition for rehearing, appellants maintain that we have “inherent jurisdiction” to
13 determine whether respondent properly computed the amount of interest owed by appellants. Appellants
14 argue that this “inherent jurisdiction” derives from our statutory authority as the tribunal constituted for
15 hearing and deciding administrative appeals from final actions taken by respondent. Appellants also
16 contend that they are entitled to interest suspension pursuant to the plain language of Revenue and
17 Taxation Code section 19116 and as provided in FTB Notice 2005-4, in which respondent stated that
18 interest would be automatically refunded to taxpayers who met the requirements specified therein.

19 Although appellants present a different basis for our authority to hear and decide the
20 appeal, we conclude that appellants have not shown good cause for rehearing on any of the grounds
21 enumerated in *Appeal of Wilson Development, Inc., supra*. In support of their contention of
22 jurisdictional authority, appellants generally cite the appeal provisions and one section of Taxpayers’
23 Bill of Rights Act provisions of the Revenue and Taxation Code. However, it is well-settled in
24 California law that administrative agencies, such as this board, have only the powers conferred on them
25 either expressly or by implication under the Constitution or statutes. (*AFL v. Unemp. Ins. Appeals Bd.*
26 (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1017, 1042.) Thus, we may exercise our jurisdiction only in accordance with
27 applicable legal authority.

28 In this regard, Revenue and Taxation Code section 19752, subdivision (a)(4), provides

1 that, “notwithstanding” other provisions of the Revenue and Taxation Code that afford a taxpayer the
2 right to claim a refund, a taxpayer who elects to participate in the VCI, Option 1 is barred from filing a
3 claim for refund. The term “notwithstanding” is considered to be an expression of legislative intent that
4 the statute controls in the circumstances covered by its provisions, despite the existence of other law
5 which would otherwise apply to require a different or contrary outcome. (See *In Re Summer H.* (2006)
6 139 Cal.App.4th 1315, 1328.) Therefore, a taxpayer who elects to participate in the VCI, Option 1 is
7 barred from claiming a refund and this board may exercise its jurisdiction, under these circumstances,
8 only upon the filing of a valid claim for refund. Consequently, we conclude that the opinion was not
9 against the law and that appellants have not demonstrated an error of law. We further conclude that the
10 remaining issues are the same as those raised in the appeal and, as such, also do not present any of the
11 cognizable grounds for rehearing.

12 ///

13 ///

14 ///

15 Du-FOPR-la.doc

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ORDER

Pursuant to the views expressed in the opinion of the Board on file in this proceeding,
and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the petition be, and the
same is, hereby dismissed, and this Board's decision of July 17, 2007 be, and the same hereby is,
affirmed.

Done at Culver City, California, this 26th day of February, 2008, by the State Board of
Equalization, with Board Members Ms. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel, and Ms. Marcy Jo
Mandel* present.

Judy Chu, Ph.D., Chair

Betty T. Yee, Member

Bill Leonard, Member

Michelle Steel, Member

Marcy Jo Mandel*, Member

*For John Chiang per Government Code section 7.9.