

Letter of Findings: 08-0461P
Withholding Tax
For the Tax Year Ending December 31, 2003

NOTICE: Under IC § 4-22-7-7, this document is required to be published in the Indiana Register and is effective on its date of publication. It shall remain in effect until the date it is superseded or deleted by the publication of a new document in the Indiana Register. The publication of the document will provide the general public with information about the Department's official position concerning a specific issue.

ISSUE

I. Withholding Tax - Twenty-Percent Penalty.

Authority: IC § 2-5-3-1; IC § 6-3-2-2.8; IC § 6-3-4-13; IC § 6-8.1-5-1; IC § 6-8.1-10-2.1; [45 IAC 15-11-2](#).

Taxpayer seeks abatement of the twenty-percent penalty for failure to file Form WH-1 and remit withholding tax for non-resident shareholders.

II. Tax Administration - Duties, Powers, Responsibilities – Reliance on Oral Advice.

Authority: [45 IAC 15-3-2](#)(e); Indiana Dep't of Env'tl. Management v. Conrad, 614 N.E.2d 916 (Ind. 1993); Cablevision of Chicago v. Colby Cable Corp., 417 N.E.2d 348 (Ind. Ct. App. 1981).

Taxpayer states that it relied on conflicting oral advice received from an Indiana Department of Revenue official.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Taxpayer is an S-Corporation. Taxpayer failed to file Form WH-1s and withhold tax on its non-resident shareholders for the year ending December 31, 2003. Taxpayer was assessed a twenty-percent penalty pursuant to IC § 6-8.1-10-2.1(h).

I. Withholding Tax - Twenty-Percent Penalty.

DISCUSSION

Taxpayer believes that it is entitled to abatement of the twenty-percent penalty for failure to file Form WH-1 and remit withholding tax on its non-resident shareholders.

Taxpayer argues that its nonresident shareholders timely filed individual tax returns and timely paid the tax that was due. Taxpayer maintains that no withholding tax was due from it, the S-Corporation, because its individual shareholders paid his or her 2003 taxes, a year in advance, by requesting that any refunds from the individual's 2002 tax year be applied to the individual's 2003 taxes.

Pursuant to IC § 6-3-2-2.8(2):

Notwithstanding any provision of [IC 6-3-1](#) through [IC 6-3-7](#), there shall be no tax on the adjusted gross income of the following:

(2) Any corporation which is exempt from income tax under Section 1363 of the Internal Revenue Code and which complies with the requirements of [IC 6-3-4-13](#). However, income of a corporation described under this subdivision that is subject to income tax under the Internal Revenue Code is subject to the tax under [IC 6-3-1](#) through [IC 6-3-7](#). A corporation will not lose its exemption under this section because it fails to comply with [IC 6-3-4-13](#) but it will be subject to the penalties provided by [IC 6-8.1-10](#).

According to IC § 6-3-4-13(a)-(j), in relevant part:

(a) Every corporation which is exempt from tax under [IC 6-3](#) pursuant to [IC 6-3-2-2.8](#)(2) shall, at the time that it pays or credits amounts to any of its nonresident shareholders as dividends or as their share of the corporation's undistributed taxable income, withhold the amount prescribed by the department. Such corporation so paying or crediting any nonresident shareholder:

- (1) shall be liable to the state of Indiana for the payment of the tax required to be withheld under this section and shall not be liable to such shareholder for the amount withheld and paid over in compliance or intended compliance with this section; and
- (2) when the aggregate amount due under [IC 6-3](#) and [IC 6-3.5](#) exceeds one hundred fifty dollars (\$150) per quarter, then such corporation shall make return and payment to the department quarterly, on such dates and in such manner as the department shall prescribe, of the amount of tax which, under [IC 6-3](#) and [IC 6-3.5](#), it is required to withhold.

(b) Every corporation shall, at the time of each payment made by it to the department pursuant to this section, deliver to the department a return upon such form as shall be prescribed by the department showing the total amounts paid or credited to its nonresident shareholders, the amount withheld in accordance with the provisions of this section, and such other information as the department may require. Every corporation withholding as provided in this section shall furnish to its nonresident shareholders annually, but not later than the fifteenth day of the third month after the end of its taxable year, a record of the amount of tax withheld on behalf of such shareholders on forms to be prescribed by the department.

(c) All money withheld by a corporation, pursuant to this section, shall immediately upon being withheld be the money of the state of Indiana and every corporation which withholds any amount of money under the

provisions of this section shall hold the same in trust for the state of Indiana and for payment thereof to the department in the manner and at the times provided in [IC 6-3](#). Any corporation may be required to post a surety bond in such sum as the department shall determine to be appropriate to protect the state of Indiana with respect to money withheld pursuant to this section.

(d) The provisions of [IC 6-8.1](#) relating to additions to tax in case of delinquency and penalties shall apply to corporations subject to the provisions of this section, and for these purposes any amount withheld, or required to be withheld and remitted to the department under this section, shall be considered to be the tax of the corporation, and with respect to such amount it shall be considered the taxpayer.

...

(i) If a corporation fails to withhold and pay any amount of tax required to be withheld under this section and thereafter the tax is paid by the shareholders, such amount of tax as paid by the shareholders shall not be collected from the corporation but it shall not be relieved from liability for interest or penalty otherwise due in respect to such failure to withhold under [IC 6-8.1-10](#).

(j) A corporation described in subsection (a) may file a composite adjusted gross income tax return on behalf of some or all nonresident shareholders if it complies with the requirements prescribed by the department for filing a composite return.

(Emphasis added).

IC § 6-8.1-10-2.1(d)-(h), in relevant part, provides:

(d) If a person subject to the penalty imposed under this section can show that the failure to file a return, pay the full amount of tax shown on the person's return, timely remit tax held in trust, or pay the deficiency determined by the department was due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the department shall waive the penalty.

(e) A person who wishes to avoid the penalty imposed under this section must make an affirmative showing of all facts alleged as a reasonable cause for the person's failure to file the return, pay the amount of tax shown on the person's return, pay the deficiency, or timely remit tax held in trust, in a written statement containing a declaration that the statement is made under penalty of perjury. The statement must be filed with the return or payment within the time prescribed for protesting departmental assessments. A taxpayer may also avoid the penalty imposed under this section by obtaining a ruling from the department before the end of a particular tax period on the amount of tax due for that tax period.

(f) The department shall adopt rules under [IC 4-22-2](#) to prescribe the circumstances that constitute reasonable cause and negligence for purposes of this section.

...

(h) A corporation which otherwise qualifies under [IC 6-3-2-2.8\(2\)](#) but fails to withhold and pay any amount of tax required to be withheld under [IC 6-3-4-13](#) shall pay a penalty equal to twenty percent (20 [percent]) of the amount of tax required to be withheld under [IC 6-3-4-13](#). This penalty shall be in addition to any penalty imposed by section 6 of this chapter.

(Emphasis added).

Under IC § 6-8.1-5-1(b), "The burden of proving that the proposed assessment is wrong rests with the person against whom the proposed assessment is made." An assessment – including the negligence penalty – is presumptively valid.

Departmental regulation [45 IAC 15-11-2\(b\)](#) defines negligence as "the failure to use such reasonable care, caution, or diligence as would be expected of an ordinary reasonable taxpayer." Negligence is to "be determined on a case-by-case basis according to the facts and circumstances of each taxpayer." Id.

IC § 6-8.1-10-2.1(d) allows the Department to waive the penalty upon a showing that the failure to pay the deficiency was based on "reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect." Departmental regulation [45 IAC 15-11-2\(c\)](#) requires that in order to establish "reasonable cause," the taxpayer must demonstrate that it "exercised ordinary business care and prudence in carrying out or failing to carry out a duty giving rise to the penalty imposed...."

Pursuant to IC § 2-5-3-1:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the general assembly of the state of Indiana to promote a revenue raising structure in Indiana that will provide adequate revenues to carry on the efficient operation of the state, county, and city governments and at the same time will assure that its burdens will be shared equitably by all taxpayers. It is further declared to be the policy of the general assembly of the state of Indiana to encourage and bring about the accomplishment of enforcement policies and administrative practices that will result in maximum return from existing taxes to the state of Indiana at a minimum cost to the taxpayers.

In imposing the twenty-percent penalty for failure to file Form WH-1 and remit withholding tax on non-resident shareholders, the Department is enforcing a provision of the Indiana Code to ensure the continued compliance with Indiana law. The requirement of filing a Form WH-1 and the withholding on taxpayer's non-resident shareholders is the state's way of ensuring that the Department is provided with information it needs to carry out its objectives in the most efficient manner. The withholding requirements imposed upon the taxpayer in this instance are more efficient than the unreasonably burdensome method of the Department trying to match

non-resident shareholders to their respective S-Corporations in order to ensure that voluntary compliance with the Indiana tax laws.

Therefore, Taxpayer has not provided substantive evidence in support of its protest.

FINDING

Taxpayer's protest is denied.

II. Tax Administration - Duties, Powers, Responsibilities – Reliance on Oral Advice.

DISCUSSION

Taxpayer states it relied on conflicting information it received from Indiana Department of Revenue "officials" who told them the tax could be paid by shareholder estimate and applied refunds.

[45 IAC 15-3-2\(e\)](#) states:

Oral opinions or advice will not be binding upon the department. However, taxpayers may inquire as to whether or not the department will make a ruling or determination based on the facts presented by the taxpayer. If the taxpayer wishes a ruling by the department, the formal request must be in writing. A taxpayer may also orally receive technical assistance from the department in preparation of returns. However this advice is advisory only and is not binding in the latter examination of returns.

Based upon general inquiries and correspondence, the department often issues written letters of advice.

Such letters are advisory in nature only and merely technical assistance tools for the taxpayer. Strictly informational type letters are not to be considered rulings by the department and will not be binding.

However, some written inquiries have asked for the tax consequences of a particular transaction, based upon the facts presented. In such instances, the department may consider such letters as rulings that may bind the department to the position stated in respect to that taxpayer only. All such rulings issued will be binding provided that all of the facts described in obtaining the ruling are true and accurate. Any misstatement of material fact or information will void the ruling.

The plain language of the rule clearly states that oral opinions will not be binding on the Department. Even when a taxpayer orally receives technical assistance from the Department, the advice is advisory only and is not binding on further examination of actual returns, such as the audit in this case.

In effect, Taxpayer is arguing that having provided incorrect advice, the Department is "estopped" from thereafter taking advantage of that bad advice. However, in *Indiana Dep't of Env'tl. Management v. Conrad*, 614 N.E.2d 916 (Ind. 1993) the Indiana Supreme Court stated:

As a general rule, equitable estoppel will not be applied against government authorities. The state will not be estopped in the absence of clear evidence that its agents made representations upon which the party asserting estoppel relied. The party claiming estoppel has the burden to establish all facts necessary to constitute it. To make out a claim of estoppel, one must show: (1) a representation or concealment of material fact; (2) made by a person with knowledge of the fact and with the intention that the other party should act upon it; (3) to a party ignorant of the matter; and (4) which induced the other party to act upon it to his detriment. *Id.* at 921 (citations omitted).

Furthermore, in spite of alleged oral representations made by Department officials, there are strong public policy reasons why the Department cannot be estopped from collecting taxes or imposing related penalties. Indeed, estoppels against the public are disfavored because "if laches, waiver or estoppel did apply against the public, a dishonest, incompetent or negligent public official could wreck the interests of the public." *Cablevision of Chicago v. Colby Cable Corp.*, 417 N.E.2d 348, 354 (Ind. Ct. App. 1981) (internal quotation marks omitted). "Our courts have been particularly unsolicitous of estoppel and laches arguments in cases where the unauthorized acts of public officials somehow implicate government spending powers." *Id.* Estoppel is disapproved in cases of government spending or in case involving revenue laws because estoppel would destroy the effect of such laws. *Id.* at 355.

Taxpayer has not shown any factual or legal reason why the Department's rule should not apply.

FINDING

Taxpayer's protest is denied.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Taxpayer protests of Issue I and Issue II are denied.

Posted: 12/17/2008 by Legislative Services Agency
An [html](#) version of this document.