

**Letter of Findings: 65-20221673
Indiana Overweight Civil Penalty
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 This document is effective on its date of publication and remains in effect until the date it is superseded or deleted by the publication of another document in the Indiana Register.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 reduced.

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 9-20-18-7](#); [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 a Canadian-based trucking company. On May 26, 2022, the Indiana State Police ("ISP") cited Taxpayer's commercial motor vehicle for an overweight violation for being overweight on an axle and overweight on gross weight. As a result, the Indiana Department of Revenue ("Department") issued Taxpayer a proposed assessment for an overweight violation under [IC 9-20-18-14.5\(c\)](#).

Taxpayer protested the assessment. The Department held an administrative hearing with the Taxpayer. 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 argues that it has already paid the citation with ISP and therefore that fine should be enough. Taxpayer also argues that there are other factors that should be considered by the Department in making its decision.

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\(c\)](#):

The 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.

See also *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, "when [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"). The Department may also impose a civil penalty for vehicles or loads in excess of the size or weight limits provided in IC Art. 9-20 and for which no permit is available for the excess size or weight ("No Permit Available 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.

[IC 9-20-18-7](#) provides defenses which taxpayers may rely on when they submit their protest to the Department.

Taxpayer's gross vehicle weight was 82,740 pounds. The maximum weight allowed without a permit is 80,000 pounds. ISP cited Taxpayer's vehicle for being 2,740 pounds overweight overall, and 4,300 pounds overweight on one axle group in violation of [IC 9-20-4-1](#). The Department imposed a "No Permit Civil Penalty" in accordance with [IC 9-20-18-14.5\(c\)](#) because Taxpayer was in excess of the legal weight. Under IC Art. 9-20, a permit is available for instances where vehicles are overweight.

Taxpayer argued that it should not incur a civil penalty in addition to ISP's fine. The Department notes that [IC 9-20-18-14.5\(a\)](#) plainly states that the civil penalties imposed under that section are in addition to and separate from any settlement or agreement made with a local court or political subdivision regarding the traffic stop. Therefore, Taxpayer's argument that it paid a different fine is incorrect. Taxpayer also argued that unique factors should be considered; namely, that the driver blew a tire before the stop and filled up the fuel tank (putting extra weight on the vehicle). Taxpayer asserted that it exercises due diligence in following the laws, and this was its second violation.

While Taxpayer has not established that the vehicle in question was not over the allowed weight, [IC 9-20-18-14.5](#) provides "not more than" language for the Department to consider when generating a proposed assessment amount. Considering Taxpayer's history of compliance at the time of this inspection and information gathered during the protest process, the Department will generate a proposed assessment with a reduced amount as authorized by its statutory discretion and this Letter of Findings.

FINDING

Taxpayer's protest is sustained in part and denied to the extent that Taxpayer did not prove the entire penalty should be removed.

April 17, 2023

Posted: 06/28/2023 by Legislative Services Agency
An [html](#) version of this document.