

**Letter of Findings: 65-20221784  
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 This document is effective on its date of publication and remains in effect until the date it is superseded or deleted by the publication of another document in the Indiana Register.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 did not provide sufficient evidence to establish 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 trucking company based outside Indiana. On October 11, 2022, the Indiana State Police ("ISP") cited Taxpayer's commercial motor vehicle for an overweight violation for being overweight on its total gross weight and being off route. 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, requesting a final determination without a hearing. 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 regarding one of its trucks. Taxpayer argues that the penalty should be lowered.

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.

ISP cited Taxpayer's vehicle for being 39,280 pounds over gross weight 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 more than the legal gross weight of 80,000 pounds.

Taxpayer argues it is a carrier that takes safety seriously, and that the driver here did not call and did not follow the instructions given. Taxpayer further argues that the driver did not follow the permit route or ask any questions. Taxpayer provided a list of corrective actions to be taken. Here, the carrier is responsible for making sure that all of its drivers recognize when they are grossly overweight. Taxpayer has provided no evidence that there were any errors in the receipt of the citation.

[IC 9-20-18-14.5](#) provides "not more than" language for the Department to consider when generating a proposed assessment amount. Considering how much the truck was over the allowed gross weight and the fact that the driver was off route, the Department will not reduce the penalty in this case.

### FINDING

Taxpayer's protest is respectfully denied.

September 6, 2023

*Finding Replaces: New*

*Posted: 12/06/2023 by Legislative Services Agency*  
An [html](#) version of this document.