

**Letter of Findings: 65-20221469
Indiana Overweight Proposed Assessment
For The Year 2022**

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 Indiana Department of Revenue's official position concerning a specific set of facts and issues. This document is effective on its date of publication and remains in effect until the date it is superseded or deleted by the publication of another document in the Indiana Register.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

Motor Carrier provided sufficient evidence that the civil penalty should be vacated.

ISSUE

I. Motor Vehicles - Overweight Penalty.

Authority: IC § 6-8.1-5-1; IC § 6-8.1-1-1; IC § 9-20-1-1; IC § 9-20-1-2; IC § 9-20-4-1; IC § 9-20-18-14.5; *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).

Taxpayer protests the assessment of an overweight civil penalty.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Taxpayer is an Indiana based trucking company. On May 13, 2022, the Indiana State Police ("ISP") cited Taxpayer's commercial motor vehicle for an overweight violation for being overweight on gross vehicle weight as provided by IC § 9-20-18-14.5(d). After learning of the overweight violation, the Indiana Department of Revenue ("Department") issued Taxpayer a proposed assessment for an overweight violation in the form of a "No Permit Available Civil Penalty."

Taxpayer protested the assessment. An administrative hearing was held. This Letter of Findings results. Additional facts will be provided as necessary.

I. Motor Vehicles - Overweight Penalty.

DISCUSSION

Taxpayer protests the imposition of a penalty for an overweight violation of one of its trucks. Taxpayer provided an explanation of events along with written statements from the driver and company mechanic. Taxpayer indicated its mechanic spoke with an ISP Supervisor regarding the vehicle inspection. The ISP Supervisor reviewed the body cam footage of the vehicle stop and indicated the ISP trooper conducting the stop did not actually weigh the vehicle. The ISP Supervisor indicated the ISP trooper was going to "pull the warning to clear the violation." Post-hearing, the Department received a written statement directly from an ISP Commander in the Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Division regarding this incident. The ISP Commander confirmed that the ISP trooper completed the inspection improperly and wrote a violation without weighing the vehicle.

As a threshold issue, it is Taxpayer's responsibility to establish that the existing proposed assessment is incorrect. As stated in IC § 6-8.1-5-1(c), "[t]he notice of proposed assessment is prima facie evidence that the [D]epartment's claim for the unpaid tax is valid, including during an action appealed to the tax court under this chapter. 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).

The Department notes that, "[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 shall be entitled to deference.

According to IC § 9-20-1-1, "[e]xcept as otherwise provided in [IC Art. 9-20], a person, including a transport operator, may not operate or move upon a highway a vehicle or combination of vehicles of a size or weight exceeding the limitations provided in [IC Art. 9-20]."

According to IC § 9-20-1-2, the owner of a vehicle "may not cause or knowingly permit to be operated or moved upon a highway [in Indiana] a vehicle or combination of vehicles of a size or weight exceeding the limitations provided in [IC Art. 9-20]."

IC § 9-20-18-14.5 authorizes the Department to impose civil penalties against Motor Carriers that obtain a permit under IC Art. 9-20 and violate IC Art. 9-20 ("Permit Violation Civil Penalty") or are required, but fail, to obtain a permit under IC Art. 9-20 ("No Permit Civil Penalty").

IC § 6-8.1-1-1 states that fees and penalties stemming from IC Art. 9-20 violations are a "listed tax." Under IC § 9-20-18-14.5(a) these listed taxes are in addition to and separate from any settlement or agreement made with a local court or political subdivision regarding the traffic stop.

The ISP trooper conducting the vehicle inspection noted Taxpayer's gross vehicle weight as "67,300/67,200." The Department imposed a "No Permit Available Civil Penalty" in accordance with IC § 9-20-18-14.5(d) based on the information provided by ISP. However, considering the information provided during the protest process, Taxpayer has proven the ISP trooper conducting the inspection did not actually weigh the vehicle. Given the unique circumstances surrounding Taxpayer's assessment, the Department will exercise its discretion and vacate the civil penalty. Taxpayer's protest is sustained.

FINDING

Taxpayer's protest is sustained, and the entire civil penalty will be dismissed.

October 28, 2022

Posted: 06/07/2023 by Legislative Services Agency
An [html](#) version of this document.