

**Letter of Findings: 65-20221814  
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 This document is effective on its date of publication and remains in effect until the date it is superseded or deleted by the publication of another document in the Indiana Register.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 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 9-20-4-2](#); [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 an Indiana-based trucking company. On October 4, 2022, the Indiana State Police ("ISP") cited Taxpayer's commercial motor vehicle for an overweight violation for being overweight. As a result, the Indiana Department of Revenue ("Department") issued Taxpayer a proposed assessment for an overweight violation.

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 of one of its trucks under [IC 9-20-18-14.5\(c\)](#). Taxpayer argues the penalty should be reduced; it argues that the company has a clean history with the Department and other factors.

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 86,600 pounds. ISP cited Taxpayer's vehicle for being 6,600 pounds overweight on its 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 in excess of the legal allowable weight.

Taxpayer argues that it should pay a lower penalty because it has a clean history with the Department and there were factors out of its control. Taxpayer in its protest letter states that the truck was loaded out of a farm facility without a scale, using only the gauges from the truck as a way to give a rough estimate of its weight. According to Taxpayer it was using a route that avoided highways, however an accident on the day of the stop caused it to have to use the highway. Finally, it argues that the overall weight was under the 10 percent commodity allowance because the load it was transporting was grain loaded at the farm.

Taxpayer provided nothing useful for its protest to the Department outside of its protest letter and the vehicle examination report. Taxpayer did not cite to any laws but states the provisions falls under an exemption; the Department found the closest one to be under [IC 9-20-4-2](#). This statute provides a limited buffer for farm produce and aggregates. By Taxpayer's own admissions, its situation falls outside of the 10 percent buffer it mentioned because on the day it was stopped, the vehicle was on an interstate highway which [IC 9-20-4-2\(c\)](#) addresses. [IC 9-20-4-2\(c\)](#) provides "the exemptions in subsection (a) do not apply to. . . (2) A vehicle operated on any part of an interstate highway."

While Taxpayer has not established that the weight of 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 of penalty 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.

November 15, 2023

*Finding Replaces: New*

*Posted: 01/31/2024 by Legislative Services Agency*  
An [html](#) version of this document.