

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE REVENUE

04-20180057.LOF

Letter of Findings Number: 04-20180057  
Sales Tax  
For Tax Years 2014-15

**NOTICE:** IC § 6-8.1-3-3.5 and IC § 4-22-7-7 require the publication of this document in the Indiana Register. This document provides the general public with information about the Department's official position concerning a specific set of facts and issues. This document is effective as of its date of publication and remains in effect until the date it is superseded or deleted by the publication of another document in the Indiana Register. The "Holding" section of this document is provided for the convenience of the reader and is not part of the analysis contained in this Letter of Findings.

**HOLDING**

Business did not provide any documentation or analysis in support of its protest. Therefore, Business did not meet the burden of proving the proposed assessments wrong.

**ISSUE****I. Sales Tax–Taxable Sales.**

**Authority:** IC § 6-2.5-2-1; IC § 6-8.1-5-1; IC § 6-8.1-5-4; IC § 6-9-25-1; IC § 6-9-25-2; IC § 6-9-25-4; IC § 6-9-25-5; IC § 6-9-25-6; *Dept. of State Revenue v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, 15 N.E.3d 579 (Ind. 2014); *Indiana Dept. of State Revenue v. Rent-A-Center East, Inc.*, 963 N.E.2d 463 (Ind. 2012); *Lafayette Square Amoco, Inc. v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue*, 867 N.E.2d 289 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2007); *Wendt LLP v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue*, 977 N.E.2d 480 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2012).

Taxpayer protests the imposition of sales tax.

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**

Taxpayer operates an Indiana convenience store with fuel sales. As the result of an audit, the Indiana Department of Revenue ("Department") determined that Taxpayer had not collected and remitted the proper amount of sales tax for the tax years 2014, 2015, and 2016. The Department therefore issued proposed assessments for sales tax, penalty, and interest for those years. Taxpayer sent in a written protest of the assessments for 2014 and 2015 and selected the option for the Department to make its determination without holding an administrative hearing. Taxpayer did not list the year 2016 on its protest letter, therefore the proposed assessments for 2016 are not under protest. This Letter of Findings results. Further facts will be supplied as required.

**I. Sales Tax–Taxable Sales.****DISCUSSION**

Taxpayer protests the imposition of sales tax on sales at its convenience store/gas station. In the course of the audit, the Department made four (4) separate requests for documentation via first class United States Postal Service mail and by certified mail. Taxpayer did not provide any of the requested documents. The Department therefore based its proposed assessments on the best information available. Taxpayer protests that the Department's proposed assessments are in error and that it has documentation to show that it is correct. Taxpayer filed its written protest along with the Department's "Protest Submission Form" (State Form 56317), in which it opted for the Department to make its final determination without an administrative hearing.

As a threshold issue, it is the Taxpayer's responsibility to establish that the existing tax assessment is incorrect. As stated in IC § 6-8.1-5-1(c), "The notice of proposed assessment is prima facie evidence that the department's claim for the unpaid tax is valid. The burden of proving that the proposed assessment is wrong rests with the person against whom the proposed assessment is made." *Indiana Dept. of State Revenue v. Rent-A-Center East, Inc.*, 963 N.E.2d 463, 466 (Ind. 2012); *Lafayette Square Amoco, Inc. v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue*, 867 N.E.2d 289, 292 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2007). Consequently, a taxpayer is required to provide documentation explaining and supporting his or her challenge that the Department's position is wrong. Further, "[W]hen [courts] examine a statute that an agency is 'charged with enforcing. . .[courts] defer to the agency's reasonable interpretation of [the] statute even over an equally reasonable interpretation by another party.'" *Dept. of State Revenue v. Caterpillar*,

*Inc.*, 15 N.E.3d 579, 583 (Ind. 2014). Thus, all interpretations of Indiana tax law contained within this decision, as well as the preceding audit, shall be entitled to deference.

Sales tax is imposed by IC § 6-2.5-2-1, which states:

- (a) An excise tax, known as the state gross retail tax, is imposed on retail transactions made in Indiana.
- (b) The person who acquires property in a retail transaction is liable for the tax on the transaction and, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, shall pay the tax to the retail merchant as a separate added amount to the consideration in the transaction. *The retail merchant shall collect the tax as agent for the state.* (Emphasis added).

Therefore, retail merchants are required to collect sales tax on retail transactions, unless the transaction is exempt from sales tax.

Next, the Department refers to IC § 6-8.1-5-1(b), which states:

*If the department reasonably believes that a person has not reported the proper amount of tax due, the department shall make a proposed assessment of the amount of the unpaid tax on the basis of the best information available to the department.* The amount of the assessment is considered a tax payment not made by the due date and is subject to [IC 6-8.1-10](#) concerning the imposition of penalties and interest. The department shall send the person a notice of the proposed assessment through the United States mail. (Emphasis added).

Also, the Department refers to IC § 6-8.1-5-4(a), which states:

Every person subject to a listed tax must keep books and records so that the department can determine the amount, if any, of the person's liability for that tax by reviewing those books and records. *The records referred to in this subsection include all source documents necessary to determine the tax, including invoices, register tapes, receipts, and canceled checks.* (Emphasis added).

Therefore, all taxpayers subject to a listed tax must keep books and records such as, but not limited to, invoices, register tapes, receipts, and cancelled checks, as provided by IC § 6-8.1-5-4-(a). If the Department reasonably believes that a person has not reported the proper amount of tax due, the department shall make a proposed assessment of the amount of the unpaid tax on the basis of the best information available to the department, as provided by IC § 6-8.1-5-1(b). In the instant case, the Department had no records to review and so used the best information available in reaching its conclusion that Taxpayer did not report the proper amount of tax due.

In this case, Taxpayer has not provided any analysis or documentation in support of its bare protest of the assessments for 2014 and 2015. Taxpayer has not presented a sufficiently developed argument for the Department to address. See *Wendt LLP v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue*, 977 N.E.2d 480, 485 n.9, (Ind. Tax Ct. 2012) (stating in a footnote parenthetical "that poorly developed and non-cogent arguments are subject to waiver" by the Indiana Tax Court) (citing *Scopelite v. Indiana Dep't of Local Gov't Fin.*, 939 N.E.2d 1138, 1145 (Ind. Tax. Ct. 2010)). Therefore, Taxpayer has failed to meet the requirement of proving the proposed assessments wrong, as provided by IC § 6-8.1-5-1(c).

## FINDING

Taxpayer's protest is denied.

February 26, 2018

Posted: 04/25/2018 by Legislative Services Agency  
An [html](#) version of this document.